THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

VOLUME 16, 1941

Reprinted 1963
By Permission
Of The Original Publisher

AMS REPRINT COMPANY
New York 3, N. Y.

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. XVI 1941

CONTENTS

PAGE

Shakspere and His Contemporaries in the literature of 1940: A classified bibliography ..... *S. A. Tannenbaum* 2

Index of Names and Subjects in the 1940 Bibliography ..... *Ralph P. Rosenberg* 17

In Defense of Bassanio ..... *J. M. Ariail* 25

I Know a Hawk from a Handsaw ..... *Haldeen Braddy* 29

Shakspere's Dukes ..... *Curtis B. Watson* 33

A Contemporary Attack Upon Shakspere? ..... *Alfred Harbage* 42

An Early *Hamlet* Allusion ..... *Howard Schultz* 50

Spenser's Fable of *"The Oake and the Brere"* ..... *Louis S. Friedland* 52

Editorial Notes and Comments ..... *S. A. T.* 58

Communication: Which Daniel? ..... *John E. Hannigan* 63

The Rebirth of Tragedy ..... *William Van O'Connor* 67

"The Lunatic, The Lover and The Poet" ..... *M. Ellwood Smith* 77

Images in *The Faerie Queene* Drawn from Flora and Fauna, *Grace Warren Landrum* 89

Performances of Shaksperian Plays at Covent Garden and Drury Lane Theaters, *Margaret Ruth Lewery* 102

Raw Materials for a Shakspere Biography ..... *Samuel A. Tannenbaum* 104

A Borrowing from Caviceo for the Legend of Romeo and Juliet, *William F. J. DeJongh* 118

Notes on Shylock, Angelo and Falstaff ..... *A. S. Pushkin* 120

Communications:

Notes on Shylock, Angelo and Falstaff ..... *Albert Ségal* 122

A Second Daniel ..... *Robert Withington* 123

The Fencing Match in Hamlet ..... *Allan H. Gilbert* 124

How Much of Shakspere Did Voltaire Know? ..... *Percy G. Adams* 126

Editorial Notes and Comments ..... *S. A. T.* 127

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Images in *The Faerie Queene* Drawn from Flora and Fauna	*Grace Warren Landrum*	131
The True Text of *King Lear*	*Leo Kirschbaum*	140
A Note on Wilson's *Hamlet*	*N. B. Allen*	154
"Making the Green One Red"	*Russell K. Alspach*	166
Hamlet and the Gonzago Murders	*Samuel A. Tannenbaum*	169
The Relation between *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and Jonson's *Every Man is His Humour*	*Sallie Sewell*	175
Communication: Portia, Daniel, Susanna	*John E. Hannigan*	190
The Shakspere-Bacon-Oxford-Whoozis Mixup	*Mark Holstein*	195
Ophelia Lies	*Samuel A. Tannenbaum*	215
Et Il Illyria Feste	*J. W. Draper*	220
Scottish Shakspere	*R. Morrell Schmitz*	229
Shakspere's Chameleons and Salamanders	*James A. S. McPeek*	237
Hotspur and Falstaff	*Samuel A. Small*	243
Another Medieval Convention in Shakspere	*Ernest H. Cox*	249
Editorial Notes and Comments	*S. A. T.*	254
Communication	*Robert Withington*	256

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

SHAKSPERE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

(A Classified Bibliography for 1940)

Compiled by

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

The following bibliography, based on an examination of the contents of more than 1,400 periodicals and hundreds of books, is a continuation of that published in this BULLETIN in January, 1940. Perfunctory notices of books, blurbs, and reviews which contribute nothing new, have not been noted. The names of female writers are distinguished by a colon (instead of a period) after the initial letter of the baptismal name. The titles of books and pamphlets are printed in italics. If no year is mentioned in connection with an item, '1940' is to be understood. Reviews of books are listed (without a preceding number), without title, immediately after the books themselves. The discussion of a book is indicated by printing the title within single quotes. The abbreviations employed herein, and what they stand for, follow herewith:

A	—Anglia
Abstr.	—Abstract
Amer.	—American
B	—Bulletin
bib.	—bibliography
BJRL	—Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
Cambr.	—Cambridge
comp.	—compiler
Col.	—Columbia
CR	—Contemporary Review
CUP	—Cambridge University Press
Diss.	—Dissertation
d	—der, die, das, dem, etc.
dt.	—deutsch, deutscher, etc.
ed., edd.	—editor, editors
ELH	—Journal of English Literary History
Eliz'n	—Elizabethan
Engl.	—English, Englische
ES	—Englische Studien
facs., facss.	—facsimile, facsimiles
f	—für
Fr	—French
fr	—from
Hist	—History
HLQ	—Huntington Library Quarterly
HUP	—Harvard University Press
ils	—illustrated, illustrations
intr	—introduction
J	—Journal
JEGP	—Journal of English and Germanic Philology
Libr	—Library
Lit	—Literature
Ln	—London.
M	—Magazine
MLN	—Modern Language Notes
MLQ	—Modern Language Quarterly
MLR	—Modern Language Review
MP	—Modern Philology
mus	—music
NQ	—Notes and Queries
OUP	—Oxford University Press
P	—Press
pll	—plates
PMLA	—Publications of the Modern Language Ass'n.
port(s)	—portrait(s)
p. p.	—privately printed
PQ	—Philological Quarterly
Proc	—Proceedings
Q	—Quarterly.
QR	—Quarterly Review
R	—Review, Revue
RES	—Review of English Studies
Ru	—Russian
SAB	—Shakespeare Ass'n Bulletin
Sh	—Shakespeare, Shakspere
Shn	—Shaksperian
SJ	—Shakespeare Jahrbuch
SP	—Studies in Philology
TLS	—Times Literary Supplement (Ln)
tr.	—translator
trn	—translation
u.	—und
U	—University
UP	—University Press

The compiler's best thanks are due to the publishers, libraries, and personal friends who have assisted him in one way or another in making this compilation.

ABROAD

1. Sh in Icelandian historical survey.—S. Einarsson.—ELH, 7: 272-85, Dec.

1a. *Sh in Japan: An Historical Survey.*—M. Toyoda.—Tokyo, pp. xii + 140, bib.

ABSTRACTS

2. *More New Tales fr Sh.*—G. B. Harrison.—Ln: Nelson, 14s.

AMERICA

3. Sh's plays in Richmond, 1819-38—M. S. Shackley.—SAB, 15: 88-93, Apr., 1940.

4. Representative American criticism of Sh, 1830-85. [MS. diss., 1939].—R. P. Falk.—At the U of Wisconsin.

ANTHOLOGY

5. G. Rylands' *The Ages of Man.*—B. E. Sears.—The Adelphi, 16: 169-72, Jan.

APOCRYPHA

6. L. Theobald's alleged Sh manuscript: *The Double Falsehood.*—J. Cadwalader. —MLN, 55: 108, Feb.

AUTHORSHIP QUESTION

7. *Sh Unmasked.*—P. S. Porohovshikov.—N. Y.: Savoy Pub. Co (63 Park Row), $3.

8. Sh & the Tong epitaph.—E. B. Goodacre.—NQ, 178: 96-97 (Feb. 10).—W. Jaggard; NQ, 178: 178-79 (Mar. 9).

BACON, FRANCIS

9. The literary background of the essay 'Of death.'—M: Walters.—MLR, 35: 1-7, Jan.

10. F. B. & Oxford.—P. S. Porohovshikov.—*Sh Unmasked,* pp. 255-70.

11. F. B.—J. H. Randall—*The Making of the Modern Mind,* pp. 213-15, &c.

BACON-SHAKSPERE IMBROGLIO

12. Bacon-Sh anatomy.—W. S. Melsome. —Baconiana, 24: 175-90, Oct., 1939.

13. *The Tragedy of F. Bacon, Prince of England.*—[W. McC. Cunningham.]—Los Angeles, pp. 96, front.

14. Sh or Bacon.—E. Heron-Allen.—NQ, 179: 26, July 13.

15. Sh or Bacon.—G. W. Wright.—NQ, 179: 125, Aug. 17.
See 28.

BALE, JOHN

16. *J. B.: A Study in the Minor Literature of the Reformation.*—J. W. Harris. —Urbana: U of Illinois P., pp. 158, $1.50.

17. Baconian studies: The poet & God's word.—J. Arther.—Theosophist, 61: 37-49, Apr.

BEAUMONT & FLETCHER

18. The source of Motherwell's 'Melancholye.'—E. R. Wasserman.—MLN, 55: 296, Apr.

19. F. B.'s 'Grammar Lecture.'—M. Eccles. —RES, 16: 402-14, Oct.

BIBLE

20. *The Book of Proverbs* in Sh.—M: H. Dodds.—NQ, 179: 34, July 13.

21. The high design of *A King & No King.*—A. Mizener.—MP, 38: 133-54, Nov.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

22. *Census of Medieval & Renaissance Manuscripts in the U. S. & Canada.* [Vol. 3].—S. De Ricci & W. J. Wilson, compilers.—N. Y.: H. W. Wilson Co., pp. viii + 222, $3. (The 3 vols, $17.)

23. Sh & his contemporaries in the lit of 1939.—S. A. Tannenbaum, comp.—SAB, 15: 2-22, Jan.—Index to this bibliography prepared by R. P. Rosenberg, SAB, 15: 95-102, Apr.

24. American bibliography for 1939.—M. Henshaw, A. C. Baugh, G. Paine, *et al.* —PMLA, 54: 1199-1313, Apr.

25. H: C. Bartlett's *A Census of Sh's Plays in Quarto.*—W. W. Greg; RES, 16: 208-11, Apr.—J. Q. Adams; JEGP, 39: 405-07, July.

26. Recent lit of the Renaissance.—H. Craig, et al.—SP, 37: 283-460, Apr.

27. *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700: An Analytical Record of All Plays, Extant or Lost, Chronologically Arranged.* —A. Harbage.—Phila.: U of Pa. P, pp. [viii] + 264, $3.50.
See 89, 94.

BIOGRAPHY

28. Is Sh's will a forgery?—A. Stalker.—Quarterly R, 274: 248-62, Apr.

29. The Shn puzzle.—P. C. Ray.—Calcutta R, 73: 129-39 (Nov. 1939), 247-56 (Dec.); 74: 1-13 (Jan. 1940), 103-12 (Feb.), 231-37 (Mar.); 75: 1-12 (Apr.), 91-100 (May); 76: 1-8 (July), 115-24 (Aug.); 77: 1-10 (Oct.).

30. The spelling of Sh's surname.—M. H. Dodds.—NQ, 178: 304-05, Apr. 27.

31. An agnostic life of Sh.—R. M. Smith.—SAB, 15: 75-87, Apr.

32. The spelling of 'Sh.'—C. L. E. Ewen.—NQ, 178: 358-59 (May 18), 448 (June 22).

33. The spelling of 'Sh.'—W. Jaggard; J. Seton-Anderson; F. C. White.—NQ, 178: 392 (June 1), 412 (June 8).

34. Wm. Sh.: an epilogue.—E. K. Chambers.—RES, 16: 385-401, Oct.

35. *The Sh Documents: Facsimiles, Translations & Commentary.* (Vol. 1.)—R. B. Lewis.—Stanford UP, pp. xxiv + 324, 29 ils, bib. (Vol. 2 to follow shortly; pre-publication price for both vols, $25, post-publication price, $35.)
See 216.

BIRDS

36. Paintings of Sh's birds exhibited.—N. Y. Times, Dec. 14, p. 12.

37. *The Birds of Sh.*—L: Stockelbach.—N.p., n.d., pp. 52, front., $1.

Book Titles from Sh, Recent

38. *Leave Her to Heaven.*—J. Van Druten.—*H,* I, v, 86.

39. *Summer's Lease.*—*Son.,* XVIII, 4.

40. *The Floor of Heaven.*—S: C. Bates.—*MV,* V, i, 58.

41. *Who Tells Me True.*—M: Strange.—*A&C,* I, ii, 102.

42. *Hot Irons.*—O. Arnold & J. P. Hale.—*KJ,* IV, i, 39.

43. *The Quality of Mercy.*—G: Macurdy.—*MV,* IV, i, 184.

44. [*A*] *Comedy of* [*T*]*errors.*—M. Innes.—*Errors.*

45. *The Seeds of Time.*—A. G. Antony.—*Macbeth,* I, iii, 58.

46. *Of Heaven's Benediction.*—M: G. Nichols.—*Lear,* II, ii, 168.

47. [*Maid No More.*]—H: Simpson.—*H,* IV, v, 54.

48. *Too Dear for My Possessing.*—P: H. Johnson.—*Sonnet* 87, l. 1.

49. *This* [*Our*] *Eden.*—K: B. Burt.—*Richard II,* II, i, 42.

50. *Weep No More.*—A: Du Maurier.—*King Lear,* III, iv, 17.

51. *Nine Times Nine.*—H. H. Holmes.—*Macbeth,* I, iii, 22.

52. *Under the Greenwood Tree.*—J. L. Reynolds.—*As You Like It.*

53. *Come Unto These Yellow Sands.*—E. Schenck.—*The Tempest.*

54. *Deed Without a Name.*—D: Bowers.—*Macbeth,* IV, i, 49.

55. *Malice Domestic* — E: Cameron. — *Macbeth,* III, ii, 25.

56. *Of Human Kindness.*—R: C. Mitchell.—*Macbeth,* I, v, 18.

57. *The Evil Men Do.*—C. Fitzsimmons.—*Julius Caesar,* III, ii, 80.

57a. *This for Remembrance.*—J: Neilson.—*Hamlet,* IV, v, 175.

BRETON, NICHOLAS

58. N. B., Wm. Breton, & G. Gascoigne.—F. Flournoy.—RES, 16: 262-73, July.

CHAPMAN, GEORGE

59 G. C. & his dedication to *The Revenge.* [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism,* pp. 549-50.

COMEDY

60. *Shn comedy.*—R. E. C. Houghton.—TLS, May 4, p. 219.

61. Comedy.—A. E. Du Bois.—ELH, 7: 199-214, Sept.
See 122, 411.

COMMENTARY

62. *The Art & Life of Wm. Sh.*—H. Spencer.—N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace & Co., pp. xx + 496, 41 ils, bib., $2.25.—Sewanee R, 48: 284-86, Apr.—TLS, June 15, p. 294.—C. J. Sisson; MLN, 55: 534-36, Nov.

63. Sh's gulls.—J. S. Schell.—SAB, 15: 23-33, Jan.

64. Review of some recent books on Sh.—T. W. Baldwin.—MLN, 55: 455-62, June.

65. Roan Barbary.—P. Fatout.—SAB, 15: 67-74, Apr.

66. *The Enjoyment of Drama.*—M. Marx. —N. Y.: F. S. Crofts & Co., $2.

67. *Masters of the Drama.*—J. Gassner. —N. Y.: pp. 804, 21 ils.

68. *Preface to World Lit.*—A. Guérard.— N. Y.: pp. 536.

69. H. Baker's *Induction to Tragedy.*—A. Thaler.—JEGP, 39: 399-401, July.

70. W. C. Curry's *Sh's Philosophical Patterns.*—T. W. Baldwin.—JEGP, 39: 402-04, July.

71. *Sh & Other Masters.*—E. E. Stoll.— Harvard U P, pp. xvi + 432, $4.50.

72. *The Human Element in Literature.*— D. E. Phillips.—NY: Fortuny, pp. 230.

73. Stoll's *Sh & Other Masters.*—J. Corbin.—N. Y. Times Book R, Dec. 8, p. 34.

74. S. T. Coleridge in criticism.—F. R. Leavis.—Scrutiny, 9: 57-69, June.

75. Garrick's treatment of Sh's plays & his influence upon the attitude of Shn criticism during the 18th century. [MS. diss.]—G. W. Stone, Jr.—Harvard U.

76. Sh's dramatic romances. [MS. diss.] —W. A. Bacon.—U of Michigan.

77. Sh's old men.—L. W. Miles.—ELH, 7: 286-99, Dec.
See 31.

CONTEMPORARIES

78. W. Perkins, Eliz'n apostle of 'practical divinity.'—L. B. Wright.—HLQ, 3: 171-96, Jan.

79. *The Letters of J. Chamberlain* [With an intr.]—N. E. McClure.—Phila.: Amer. Philos. Soc., 2 vols.

80. B. Rych's *Anathomy of Ireland.*—E. M. Hinton.—PMLA, 55: 73-101, Mar.

81. Notes on I. Jones.—E. S. de Beer.— NQ, 178: 290-92 (Apr. 27), 312-15 (May 4).

82. *Catalogue of the Works of P. Holland of Coventry.*—H. Silvette.—Charlottesville, pp. xviii + 30, port., $1.50.

83. A. Nixon, plagiarist. — L. Ennis. — HLQ, 3: 377-401, July.

84. G. Harvey.—V. de S. Pinto.—TLS, Feb. 10, p. 73.

85. R. Chester.—E. B. Goodacre.—TLS, Mar. 9, p. 124.

86. A 'Drake' mystery.—C. R. Prance. — National R, 115: 221-24, Aug.

CONTEMPORARY DRAMA

87. *The Tragedies of Herod & Mariamne.* —M. J. Valency.—N. Y.: Columbia UP, pp. xiv + 304, bib, front., $3.50.

88. The whereabouts of a copy of Tomkis's *Albumazar.*—H. G. Dick.—NQ, 178: 10, Jan. 6.

89. *A Chronological List of Extant Plays Produced in or about London, 1581-1642.*—A. W. Wells, comp.—N. Y.: CUP, pp. 18.

90. The authorship of *King Leir.*—W. Wells.—NQ, 177: 434-38, Dec. 16, 1939.

91. *Eliz'n Revenge Tragedy, 1587-1642.* —F. T. Bowers.—Princeton UP, pp. x, 288, $3.

92. *The Staging of Eliz'n Plays at the Red Bull Theatre, 1605-25.*—G. F. Reynolds.—N. Y.: Modern Language Ass'n of Amer., pp. x + 204, 6 ils, $2.

93. *Masters of the Drama.*—J. Gassner. —N. Y.: Random House, pp. 804, $3.75.

94. *A Bibliography of the Engl Printed Drama to the Restoration.*—W. W. Greg, comp.—Ln, 1939, pp. xxxvi + 492, 63 pll.

95. The roaring boy in Tudor & Stuart literature.—B. Milligan.—SAB, 15: 184-90, July.

96. Eliz'n-Restoration palimpsest.—A. Harbage.—MLR, 35: 287-319, July.

97. *Eliz'n Plays & Players.*—G. B. Harrison.—Ln: Routledge, pp. viii + 306, map.

98. Bowers' *Eliz'n Revenge Tragedy.*—H. Spencer.—MLN, 55: 536-40, Nov.

99. The popular drama in England, 1600-1642. [MS. diss.]—R. M. Gorrell.— Cornell U.

100. The lesser Eliz'n playwrights on the Ln stage from 1776 to 1833. [MS. diss.] —D. J. Rulfs.—U of No. Ca.

101. Notes on H. Porter.—J. M. Nosworthy.—MLR, 35: 517- 21, Oct.
See 27, 34.

CONTEMPORARY POETRY

102. L: B. Campbell's ed'n of *The Mirror for Magistrates.*—R. B. McKerrow; RES, 16; 78-81, Jan.—H. H. Hudson; MP, 38: 104-06, Aug.

103. Eliz'n poetry 'improved.'—E. R. Wasserman.—MP, 37: 357-69, May.

104. *Harington & Ariosto: A Study in Eliz'n Verse Translation.*—T. Rich.—New Haven: Yale U P.

105. *Some 17th-Century Worthies.*—R. B. Daniels.—Chapel Hill: U of No. Ca., pp. 156, $2.

106. *From Donne to Dryden.*—R. L. Sharpe.—Chapel Hill, pp. xiv + 222.

107. *The Divine Science: The Aesthetic of Some Representative 17th-Century English Poets.*—L: Jonas.— N. Y.: Columbia UP, pp. viii + 292, $3.

CONTEMPORARY PROSE

108. T. Blundeville's *The true order & methode of wryting & reading Hystories* (1574).—H. G. Dick.—HLQ, 3: 149-70, Jan.

109. *The Conquest of the Weast India (1578): Wiih an Intr.*—F. L. de Gómara. (H. I. Priestley, ed.)—N. Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints (103 Park Ave.), pp. xxii + [420], $7.50. (Facs repr.)

110. Popular anecdotal literature in 16th-century England. [MS. diss.]—S. S. McNeely.—U of Louisiana, pp. 366.

DAVENANT, WILLIAM

111. The 'lost' canto of *Gondibert.*—J. G. McManaway.—MLQ, 1: 63-78, Mar.

112. The source of Shadwell's Sir Formal Trifle in *The Virtuoso.*—G. B. Evans.—MLR, 35: 211-14, Apr.
See 107.

DEKKER, THOMAS

113. Puritanism in the plays & pamphlets of T. D.—M: G. M. Adkins.—*Studies in English* (U of Texas, 1939), pp. 86-113.

114. Principles governing the use of variant spellings as evidence of alternate setting of two compositors.—C. Hinman.—The Library, 21: 78-94, June.

DONNE, JOHN

115. D's *Paradoxes* in 1707.—G. R. Potter.—MLN, 55: 53, Jan.

116. Verses on D's burial.—M: Brown.—NQ, 178: 12, Jan. 6.

117. D's letters from the continent in 1611-12.—R. E. Bennett.—PQ, 19: 66-78, Jan.

118. Kepler, the *Somnium,* & J. D.—M: Nicolson.—J of the Hist of Ideas, 1: 259-80, June.

119. *From J. D. to Dryden: The Revolt against Metaphysical Poetry.*—R. L. Sharp.—Chapel Hill: U of No. Carolina P. $3.

120. Textual differences in the interpretation of D's poems.—G. Williamson.—MP, 38: 37-72, Aug.

121. Scepticism in the writings of J. D. *et al.* [MS. diss.]—M: L. Wiley.—Radcliffe Coll.

DRAMA

122. *The Enjoyment of Drama.*—M. Marx.—N. Y.: Crofts, xii, 242, bib.
See 87, 107.

DRAYTON, MICHAEL

123. Contemporary praise of *Polyolbion.*—G. Tillotson, RES, 16: 181-83, Apr.
See 107, 160.

DUELING

124. *Dueling Scenes & Terms in Sh's Plays.*—H. S. Craig.—Berkeley: U of Calif. P, pp. iv + 28, bib. (Repr fr *U of Calif Public'ns in Engl,* 9: 1-28.)

EDUCATION

125. Sh read Greek.—E: T. Clark.—News Letter: Sh Fellowship, 1: 9-10. Feb.

ELISABETH, QUEEN

126. *Q. E.* — T. Maynard. — Milwaukee: Bruce Pub'g Co., $4.

ENVIRONMENT

127. L. B. Wright's *Middle-Class Culture in Eliz'n England.*—C. B. Millican.—RES, 16: 84-87, Jan.

128. F. B. Williams's *Eliz'n England.*—R. B. McKerrow.—RES, 16: 87-89, Jan.

129. The genesis of Engl nationalism.—H. Kohn.—J of the Hist of Ideas, 1: 69-94, Jan.

130. The 'Credulity' of the Eliz'ns.—M: Doran.—J of the Hist of Ideas, 1: 151-76, Apr.

131. *The Renaissance.*—W. K. Ferguson. —N. Y., pp. viii, 148.

132. *Through Eliz'n Eyes: An Abridgment of Life in Sh's England, for Junior Readers.*—J. D. Wilson.—Cambridge, pp. 108; 72c.

133. *The Tudors & the Stuarts.*—M. M. Reese.—N. Y.: Longmans, Green & Co., $2.

134. The continental origins of Engl humanism. — A. Hyma. — HLQ, 4: 1-26, Oct.

FICTIONISED

135. *Gentleman of Stratford.* [A novel.] —J. Brophy.—N. Y.: Harper, $2.50.

FORD, JOHN

136. *Burtonian Melancholy in the Plays of J. F.*—S. B. Ewing.—Princeton U Press, $1.50.
See 96.

FORGERIES

137. A famous Sh forger of yesteryear & his undoing.—E. W. Bowen.—Virginia J of Educ'n, 33; 201-04, Feb., 1940.

FRANCE

138. Baudelaire & Sh.—M. I. Baym.—SAB, 15: 131-48 (July), 195-205 (Oct.).

139. *A Bibliography of American Studies on the French Renaissance, 1500-1600.*—S. F. Will.—Urbana: U of Illinois P, pp. 152, $1.50.
See 254.

GASCOIGNE, GEORGE

140. *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres:* With introd'n, notes, & glossary. [MS. diss.]—C. T. Prouty, ed.—*Abstr of Dissertations . . . in the U of Cambridge* (1940), pp. 70-71.

GERMANY

141. Sh im Deutschunterricht.—J. Müller. —Zeitschr f Deutschkunde (1939), 53: 497-517.

142. Whose Sh?—TLS, May 4, p. 219.

142a. The treatment of Sh's obscenity by 18th-century German translators.—O. F. Jones. — *Abstr. of Dissertations,* Stanford U., 15: 77-81, Nov.

GHOSTS

143. *Die Frage d Realität d Geistererscheinungen in Sh's Dramen.* (Diss.)—G. Gronauer.—Erlangen, 1939, pp. 82.

144. Ghosts on stage & in cinema; T. C. C.; NQ, 178: 444-45 (June 22).—M. H. Dodds, NQ, 179: 104-05 (Aug. 10). —H G. L. K., NQ, 179: 138-39 (Aug. 24).

GREENE, ROBERT

145. Studies in the Greene-Sh relationship.—T. H. McNeal.—SAB, 15: 210-18, Oct.

GREVILLE, FULKE

146. G. Bullough's *Poems & Dramas of F. G.*—B. E. C. Davis, MLR, 35: 83-85, Jan., E: Carrick; RES, 16: 470-75, Oct.

147. F. G. on tragedy.—A. C. Edwards. —TLS, June 8, p. 279.

HARVEY, GABRIEL

148. G. H. & the modern languages.—C: B. Bourland.—HLQ, 4: 85-106, Oct.

HERRICK, ROBERT

149. R. H.'s sources. — G. G. Loane. — NQ, 178: 224-25, Mar. 30.
See 107, 157.

HEYWOOD, THOMAS

150. T. H. & his *Apology for Actors.* [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism,* pp 552-64.

INFLUENCE

151. T. Hardy's debt to Sh.—C. J. Weber.—*Hardy of Wessex* (N. Y.: Columbia UP, pp. 246-57, &c.

152. J. F. Cooper & Sh.—E. P. Vandiver, Jr.—SAB, 15: 110-16, Apr.

153. A. Tennyson's earliest Sh parallels. —E. A. Mooney, Jr.—SAB, 15: 117-24, Apr.

IRELAND

154. Sh was an Irishman.—T. F. Healy. —Amer. Mercury, 51: 24-32, Sept.

155. *A Historie of Ireland (1571): With an Intr.*—E. Campion. (R. B. Gottfried, ed.)—N. Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints (100 W 31st Str.), pp. [xxiv] + 140, $4.50. (Facs. repr.)

155a. Sh & the Irish.—G. Dottridge; K. D. McQuigg.—Amer. Mercury, 51: 378, Nov.

ITALY

156. Machiavelli's statecraft.—D. A. Traversi.—Scrutiny, 9: 186-93, Sept.

JONSON, BEN

157. *Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben.*—K: A. McEuen.—Cedar Rapids, Iowa: The Torch P., 1939, pp. xx + 316, bib, front, $3.

158. *Volpone* & the reputation of Venetian justice.—R. H. Perkinson.—MLR, 35: 11-18, Jan.

159. The Lord Chamberlain's Company as portrayed in *Every Man Out.*—S. A. Eliot, Jr.—*Smith College Studies in Modern Languages,* 21: 64-80.

160. B. J. in Drayton's poems.—R. W. Short.—RES, 16: 149-58, Apr.

161. B. J.'s *Engl. Grammar.*—O. Funke. —A, 64: 117-34.

162. Bodin et B. J.—J. L. Brown.—R de Litter. Comparée, 20: 66-81, Jan.

163. B. J. in Drayton's poems.—P. Simpson & K: Tillotson.—RES, 16: 303-06, July.

164. J. B. Rousseau as an imitator of B. J.—H. A. Grubbs.—MLN, 55: 170-76, Mar.

165. Caroline echoes of *The Alchemist.*—C. Leech.—RES, 16: 432-38, Oct.

166. B. J. & selections fr *E. M. O.* & *Sejanus.* [With notes.]— A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism,* pp. 534-39.

167. B. J. as social realist: *Barth. Fair.*—J. Symons.—Southern R, 6: 375-86, Oct. *See* 97, 107.

KYD, THOMAS

168. T. K. & the chronicle history.—W. Wells.—NQ, 178: 218-24 (Mar. 30), 238-43 (Apr. 6).

169. *'Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany.'* —W. Wells.—NQ, 179: 218-23 (Sept. 28), 236-40 (Oct. 5).

LANGUAGE

170. Literary features of Renaissance dictionaries.—D. T. Starnes.—SP, 37: 26-50, Jan.

171. 'Like himself.'—H. T. Price.—RES, 16: 178-81, Apr.

172 Sh in Newfoundland.—G: Tomkinson.—Dalhousie R, 20: 60-70, Apr.

173. An Eliz'n usage of 'quoth.'—A. F. Herr.—NQ, 178: 152, Mar. 2.

174. *Psychology of English.*—M: M. Bryant & J: R. Aiken.—N. Y.: Columbia U P, pp. x + 230, $2.50.

LODGE, THOMAS

175. *T. L.: A Concise Bibliography.* [473 items.]—S. A. Tannenbaum, comp.—N. Y.: The compiler, pp. x + 30, $3. *See* 97.

LYLY, JOHN

176. *J. L.: A Concise Bibliography.* [675 items.]—S. A. Tannenbaum.—N. Y.: The compiler, pp. x + 38; $3.25.

MARLOWE, CHRISTOPHER

177. C. M's atheist lecture.—P. H. Kocher.—JEGP, 39: 98-106, Jan.

178. The English *Faust Book* & the date of *Dr. Faustus.*—P. H. Kocher.—MLN, 55: 95-101, Feb.

179. *C. M.: A Biographical & Critical Study.*—F. S. Boas.—N. Y.: OUP, pp. xii, 336; 10 facss; $4.50.—NQ, 178: 197-98, Mar. 16.—P. Hutchinson; N. Y. Times Book R, June 23, p. 22.—U: Ellis-Fermor; RES, 16: 342-45, July. —TLS, June 1, p. 268.

180. C. M. & stage-history.—W. Jaggard. —NQ, 178: 233, Mar. 30.

181. The witchcraft basis in *Dr. Faustus.* —P. H. Kocher.—MP, 38: 9-36, Aug.

182. Greene, C. M. & Machiavelli.—F. S. Boas.—TLS, Aug. 3, p. 375.

183. The forged letter from G. Peele to C. M.—E. H. W. Meyerstein.—TLS, June 29, p. 315.

184. C. M.'s account of the death of Edward II.—H. W. Crundell.—NQ, 179: 207, Sept. 21.

184a. *Dr. Faustus.* [With intr & notes..] —H: L. Cohen, ed.—*Milestones of the Drama,* pp. 126-69. *See* 97.

MARSTON, JOHN

185. *John Marston: A Concise Bibliography.*—S. A. Tannenbaum.—N. Y.:

The compiler (601 W. 113th Str.), pp. x, 34; $3.25.

MASSINGER, PHILIP

186. P. M.—TLS, Mar. 16, pp. 134 & 140.

187. P. M.—C. Leech, Mar. 23, p. 147.

188. P. M. & part of I, ii, of *The Roman Actor.* [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism,* pp. 568-73.

189. *The Renegado.*—A: Senob, ed.—U of Chicago diss.

MEDICINE

190. *A Treatise of Melancholie.*—T. Bright.—N. Y.: CUP, pp. xxii + 284, $2.60. (With an intr by H Craig. Facs. of 1st ed'n, 1586.)

191. Male & female created he them.—M. Huhner.—Medical Times, Mar., pp. 4.

192. Sh's knowledge of twins & twinning.—G. Walsh & R. M. Pool.—Southern Medicine & Surgery, Apr., 4 pp. (Repr.)

193. The practice of medicine in Tudor England.—G. Smith.—Scientific Monthly, 50: 65-72, Jan.

MISCELLANEA

194. 102 holographic mss. on Sh &c. by B. Greet.—Offered for sale by G. W. Michelmore (Ln 1940), Catalogue No. 29, pp. 11-13.

195. A Sh tour in wartime.—Theatre Arts, 24: 179-81, Mar.

196. Sh — when?—I: Tyson.—SAB, 15: 57-59, Jan.

197. A First Folio stolen from Williams College.—P. Brooks.—N. Y. Times Book R, Mar. 3, p. 23, 2 ils.

198. 'Yon pomegranate tree.' [*Poem.*]—G: W. Landrum.—SAB, 15: 66, Apr.

199. The Boydell Sh.—L. Thompson.—The Princeton University Chronicle, 1: 17-24, Feb., pl.

200. The recovery of the stolen First Folio.—P. Brooks.—N. Y. Times Book R, Nov. 3, p. 18.

201. Sixteenth- and 17th-century satire against grain engrossers.—B. Milligan.—SP, 37: 585-97, Oct.

202. Sh on records.—H. T. Moore.—Theatre Arts, 24: 450-54, June.

203. Sh for pleasure.—I. C. Keller.—SAB, 15: 249-53, Oct.

204. On reading Sh.—F. E. Slade.—Poetry R, 31: 347-49, Sept.

MONTAIGNE, MICHEL de

205. The Le Brun collection of M.—I. Buffum. — The Princeton University Chronicle, I: 11-16, Feb.

206. *M. M. in France, 1812-1852.*—D. M. Frame.—N. Y.: Columbia UP, $3. *See* 256.

MUSIC

207. *Eliz'n Music and Musical Criticism.*—M. C. Boyd.—Phila.: U of Pa. P, pp. xii, 364; bib; 8 ils, $3.50.

208. A new song by Rob. Jones.—J. Q. Adams.—MLQ, 1: 45-48, Mar., facs, mus.

209. Operatic morality.—H. G. Sear.—Music & Letters, 21: 60-74, Jan.

210. Sh & music.—M. Castelnuovo-Tedesco.—SAB, 15: 166-74, July.

211. *Plots of the Operas.*—O. Thompson, ed.—N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., $2.

212. M. M. Kastendieck's *England's Musical Poet: T. Carew.*—B. Pattison.—MLR, 35: 537-40, Oct.

213. Drama & libretto: a study of 4 libretto-adaptations of 2 of Sh's plays. [MS. diss.]—J. L. Seymour.—U of Calif.

OXFORD-SHAKSPERE THEORY

214. Identifying Sh. — C. W. Barrell. — Scientific American, 162: 5-8 & 43-45, Jan., 18 ils.

215. *Eliz'n Mystery Man.*—C W. Barrell. N. Y.: A. Gauthier (17 E. 48th Str.), 25c.

216. Sh himself.—O. J. Campbell.—Harper's M, 181: 172-85, July.

PEELE, GEORGE

217. Reed and Warton on *The Old Wives Tale.*—R. H. Wilson.—PMLA, 55: 605-08, June.

217a. *G. P.: A Concise Bibliography.*—S. A. Tannenbaum, comp.—N. Y., pp. x, 36; $3.25.

PLAYS & POEMS

All's Well *(AW)*

218. *AW.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by R. Floethe.

Antony & Cleopatra

219. Janus in Alexandria.—D. B. Lyman. —Sewanee R, 48: 86-104, Jan.

220. *Der dramatische Rhythmus in 'A & C.'* (Diss.) — R. Binder. — Würzburg, 1939, pp. 174.
See 350.

As You Like It *(AY)*

221. Jacques' 7 ages & Censorinus.—A. H. Gilbert.—MLN, 55: 103-05, Feb.

222. 'AY.'—J. Smith.—Scrutiny, 9: 9-32, June.

223. The names in AY.—S. A. Tannenbaum.—SAB, 15: 255-56, Oct.

Comedy of Errors *(Errors)*

224. Sh's map for *Errors*.—G. B. Parks. —JEGP, 39: 93-97, Jan.
See 192.

Coriolanus *(Cor)*

226. 'My gracious silence.'—D. Brown.—SAB, 15: 55-56, Jan.
See 350.

Cymbeline *(Cy)*

226. *Cy.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y.: Limited Ed'ns Club, ils by Y. Berg, $5.
See 63.

Hamlet *(H)*

227. J. W. Draper's *The 'H' of Sh's Audience.*—R. A. Law.—JEGP, 39: 144-46, Jan.

228. *Hamlet Had An Uncle* [A novel.] —B. Cabell.—N. Y.: Farrar & Rinehart, pp. xxiv + 272, ils, $2.50.—L. Eshleman, N. Y. Times Book R, Jan. 28, p. 7.

229. The F1 text of *H.*—C. L. Stainer.—TLS, Jan. 6, 1940, p. 7.

230. Hamlet, Sr.—merchant or knight?—S. A. Tannenbaum.—SAB, 15: 61-62, Jan.

231. Meddling with Sh's text.—S. A. Tannenbaum.—SAB, 15: 62-64, Jan.

232. The mouse-trap.—W. W. Greg.—MLR, 35: 8-10, Jan.

233. Of men and angels.—C: B. Bourland.—*Smith College Studies in Modern Languages,* 21: 6-9.

234. The mouse-trap again.—C. J. Sisson. —RES, 16: 129-36, Apr.

235. Parrott & Craig's ed'n of *H.*—P. Alexander.—MLR, 35: 232-34, Apr.

236. Hamlet's treatment of Ophelia in the nunnery scene.—T. Sen.—MLR, 35: 145-52, Apr.

237. 'Soliloquy on Hamlet.' [*Poem.*]—A. Guiterman.—SAB, 15: 94, Apr.

238. Hamlet's 'sect & force.'—S. A. Tannenbaum.—SAB, 15: 125-26, Apr.

239. *Der Hamlet Sh's.*—H. H. Glunz.—Frankfurt, pp. 70. RM 1.75.

240. The sequence of scenes in *H.*—L. Kirschbaum.—MLN, 55: 382-87, May.

241. Hamlet's 'antic disposition.'—M. E. Finch.—*NQ,* 179: 62-63, July 27.

242. Schücking's *The Meaning of 'H.'*—M. E. Prior.—MP, 38: 106-08, Aug.

243. A bit of Sh interpretation.—C. D. Stewart.—Wisconsin M of Hist., 23: 272-80, Mar.

244 Prince Hamlet. — L. C. Knights. — Scrutiny, 9: 148-60, Sept.

245. A reading of the play-scene.—J. M. Nosworthy.—Engl Studies, 22: 161-70, Oct.

246. On artistic unity in *H.*—A. Bonjour. —Engl Studies, 21: 193-202, Oct., 1939.
See 63, 71, 399.

Henry IV *(H4)*

247. Falstaff.—B. Martin.—Dalhousie R, 19: 439-81, Jan.

248. A note on *2H4.*—R. K. Alspach.—SAB, 15: 191-92, July.

248a. *H4* (Pt 2: A new variorum ed'n.) —M. A. Shaaber, ed.—Phila.: J. B. Lippincott Co., pp. xx + 716, $7. (Appendixes on the text, date of composition, sources, criticisms, the Dering ms., acting versions, stage history, bib.).

Henry V *(H5)*

249. *H5.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by V: Willoughby.
See 171.

Henry VI *(H6)*

250. *H6* (3 vols.)—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y.: Limited Ed'ns Club, $5. (Ils by J. Charlot.)

Julius Caesar *(JC)*

251. Brutus's forum-speech.—R. W. Zandvoort.—RES, 16: 62-66, Jan.

252. *Sh Studies: JC.*—B: Coles.—N. Y.: R. R. Smith, $2.50.

253. *JC.*—P. A. Gasper, ed.—Ln, pp. 90, 1s.
See 350, 399.

King John *(KJ)*

254. Anglo-French relations in *KJ.*—M: Ash.—Etudes Anglaises, 4: 349-58.

255. *KJ.*—N. Y.: Limited Ed'ns Club; ils by V. Angelo.

King Lear *(KL)*

256. Montaigne's *Apologie* and *KL* (concluded).—W. B. D. Henderson.—SAB, 15: 40-54, Jan.

257. Hebbel's study of *KL.*—P. G. Graham.—*Smith College Studies in Modern Languages,* 21: 81-90.

258. *KL* [Collotype facs of Q1].—Ln: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1939, 10s. 6d.

259. The staging of *KL.*—W. W. Greg. RES, 16: 300-03, July.

260. Sh. & *King Leir.*—W. W. Greg.—TLS, Mar. 9, p. 124.

261. The old age of Lear.—J. W. Draper. —JEGP, 39: 527-40, Oct.

262. *KL: A Concise Bibliography* [1950 items].—S. A. Tannenbaum.—N. Y., pp. x + 102, $5.50; only 300 copies.

263. Time, place & politics in *KL.*—W. W. Greg.—MLR, 35: 431-46, Oct.

264. 'Hause' & 'slave' in *KL.*—J. Sledd. —MLN, 55: 594-96, Dec.

265. *KL* produced by the New School for Social Research.—J. B. Atkinson, N. Y. Times, Dec. 16.—R. Watts, Jr., N. Y. Herald, Dec. 16, p. 14.

266. The stage-history of *KL.* [MS. diss., 1939].—L. E. Derrick.—At the U of Texas.

267. *KL:* The moral aspect.—J. M. Nosworthy.—Engl Studies, 21: 260-68, Dec., 1939.

267a. Variants in Q1 of *KL.*—TLS, Nov. 16, p. 584.

267b. *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'KL': A Bibliographical & Critical Inquiry.*—W. W. Greg.—Ln, 1940, pp. viii + 192.

Love's Labor's Lost *(LLL)*

268. Don Armado of the Commedia dell'-arte.—D. C. Boughner.—SP, 37: 201-24, Apr.

269. On iv, iii, 285-362.—S. B. Wells.—MLN, 55: 102-03, Feb.

Macbeth *(M)*

270. *M,* I, ii.—F. Bajocchi.—TLS, Mar. 23, p. 147.

271. *M,* I, ii.—G. N. Giordano-Orsini.—TLS, Apr. 6, p. 171.

272. An emendation of IV, i, 52-53.—D. W. Thompson.—NQ, 179: 118, Aug. 17.

273. Copyhold tenure in III, ii, 38.—P. S. Clarkson & C. T. Warren.—MLN, 55: 483-93, Nov.

274. The contemporary setting of *M.* [MS. diss.]—A. N. Stunz.—U of Iowa.
See 399.

The Merchant of Venice *(MV)*

275. The Jew in Gentile fiction.—D: L. Hobman.—Contemporary R, 157: 97-103, Jan.

276. The Neapolitan prince.—E: T. Clark.—News Letter: The Sh Fellowship, 1: 12, Feb.

277. *MV* [Collotype facs of Q1.]—Ln: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1939, 10s. 6d.

278. The psychology of Shylock.—J. W. Draper.—B of the Hist of Medicine, 8: 643-50, Apr.

279. *MV.* [With intr & notes.]—H. W. Simon, ed.—N. Y.: Simon & Schuster, pp. lxvi, 146.

280. A story for a dramatist.—C. Reznikoff.—Menorah J, 28: 269-78, Oct.

281. 'A Daniel come to judgment.'—C. H. Gordon.—SAB, 15: 206-09, Oct.

Merry Wives *(MW)*

282. *MW* [1602, collotype facs].—Ln: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1939, 10s. 6d.
See 63.

Midsummer Night's Dream *(MND)*

283. Titania & the changeling.—D. C. Miller.—Engl Studies, 22: 66-70, Apr.

Much Ado About Nothing *(MA)*

284. *MA.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y.: Limited Ed'ns Club, ils by F. Kredel, $5.

285. Spenser & *MA.*—A. Thaler.—SP, 37: 225-35, Apr.

Othello *(O)*

286. Shelley & Sh: *O* & *The Cenci.*—S: R. Watson.—PMLA, 55: 611-14, June.

287. A note on *O.*—H: A. Kahin.—Modern Language Q, 1: 475-79, Dec.

288. Iago & the problem of time.—D. C. Muller.—Engl Studies, 22: 97-115, June. *See* 63, 71.

288a. Signior Brabantio, plaintiff.—J. W. Draper.—*Engl Studies,* 22: 193-98, Dec.

Passionate Pilgrim *(PP)*

289. J. Q. Adams's ed'n of *PP.*—W. W. Greg; MLN, 55: 462-64, June.—S. A. Tannenbaum, SAB, 15: 128, Apr.

290. *PP.* [Facs. of 1612 ed'n, with intr & appendix.]—H. E. Rollins, ed.—N. Y.: Scribner's Sons, pp. xlii + [138], $4.

Pericles *(Per)*

291. *Per.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by S. Ostoja-Chrostowski.

Richard II *(R2)*

292. J. D. Wilson's ed'n of *R2.*—F. E. C. H.—Baconiana, 24: 217-21 & 226-28, Oct., 1939.

293. *R2.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by A. M. Parker.

Richard III *(R3)*

294. *R3.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by F. Eichenberg.

295. A Tudor defense of Richard III.—W. G. Zeeveld.—PMLA, 55: 946-57, Dec.
See 399.

Romeo & Juliet *(R&J)*

296. *'R&J' as an Experimental Tragedy.*—H. B. Charlton.—Ln: H. Milford (N. Y. OUP), pp. 46, 85c. (Repr. fr. *Proc. of the British Academy,* vol. 25.)

297. 'Skains-Mate.'—W. W. Gill.—NQ, 179: 27, July 13.

298. *R&J.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by E. Metzl.

299. Da Porto's deviations from Masuccio.—O. H. Moore.—PMLA, 55: 934-45, Dec.
See 173.

Songs

300. *Under the Greenwood Tree.*—J: L. Reynolds, ed.—Oxford U P, ils by L. Weisgard, $2.50.

Sonnets

301. *Sh's Sonnets: A Concise Bibliography.* [1637 items].—S. A. Tannenbaum, comp.—N. Y.: The compiler, pp. xii + 88, $4.

302. The structure of figurative language in the Sts.—A. Mizener.—Southern R, 5: 730-47, Apr.

303. Light on the Dark Lady.—T. W. Baldwin; P: K. Angell.—PMLA, 55: 598-602, June.

304. *The Story of Anne Whately & Wm. Shaxspere as revealed by the Sonnets & other Eliz'n poetry.*—W. Ross.—Glasgow, 1939, pp. 232.

305. *Formal Designs from 10 Sh Sonnets.*—M: B. Pratt.—[New Brunswick, N. J., 7 Bartlett Str.], pp. [46], $2.

306. T. Brooke's ed'n of *Sh's Sonnets.*—H. Luedeke.—Engl Studies, 22: 151-55, Aug.
See 145.

The Taming of the Shrew *(TS)*

307. The integrity of *TS.*—R. A. Houk.—JEGP, 39: 222-29, Apr.

308. *TS.* [Rus trn, adapted to the stage, with notes.]—M. A. Kuzmin tr. (A. Popov & P. Urbanovich, edd.)—Moscow, pp. 168; R1.

309. *TS.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by W. A. Dwiggins.

310. *TS*: its relation to *A Shrew* and *Supposes,* with special reference to sequence & authorship. [MS. diss.]—E: S. Brenton.—Radcliffe Coll.

311. The development of the 'induction' in the Engl drama, 1582-1642. [MS. diss., 1939.]—S. P. Olmsted.—Yale U.

The Tempest *(T)*

312 Caliban, savage clown.—J. C. McCloskey.—College English, 1: 354-57, Jan.

313. The Bulgarian origins of *T.*—H. Grégoire.—SP, 37: 236-56, Apr.

314. Some notes on *T.*—A. H. King.—Engl Studies, 22: 70-74, Apr.

315. *T.*—P. A. Gasper, ed.—Ln, pp. 88, 1s.

316. *T.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by E. A. Wilson.

317. *A Discovery of the Barmudas (1610): With an Intr.*—S. Jourdain. (J. Q. Adams, ed.)—N. Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints (103 Park Ave.), pp. [x + 26], $2. (Facs reprint).
See 152, 153, 399.

Timon of Athens *(Timon)*

318. *Timon.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by G. Buday.

319. The authorship of *Timon.*—R. A. Haug.—SAB, 15: 227-48, Oct.

320. The psychology of Timon.—J. W. Draper.—MLR, 35: 521-25, Oct.
See 350.

Titus Andronicus *(Titus)*

321. *Titus.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y., ils by N. F. Lapshin.

Troilus & Cressida *(T&C)*

322. O. J. Campbell's *Comicall Satyre & 'T&C.'*—A: Walker; RES, 16: 90-92, Jan.—A. Thaler, JEGP, 39: 282-84, Apr. —W. Schmidt, Beiblatt, 51: 13-18, Jan.
See 350.

Twelfth Night *(TN)*

323. *TN* at Webster Groves High-School. [*il*].—Theatre Arts, 24: 218, Mar.

324. *TN.*—N. Y.: Limited Ed'ns Club; ils by F. Carnevali.

325. H: Hayes & M. Evans in *TN.*—B. Atkinson, N. Y. Times, Nov. 20, p. 26. —R. Lockridge, N. Y. Sun, Nov. 20, p. 8.—J. M. Brown, N. Y. Eve. Post, Nov. 20, p. 6.—E: Jordan, America, Dec. 7, p. 250.—S.A.T., SAB, 15: 254-55.

326. Three ils to *TN.*—Theatre Arts, 24: 846 & 898.
See 63, 192, 366.

Two Gentlemen of Verona *(TGV)*

327. *TGV.*—H. Farjeon, ed.—N. Y.: Ltd Ed'ns Club, ils by P. Brissaud, $5.

Venus & Adonis

328. Notes on Sh's poems.—G. G. Loane.—NQ, 178: 188-89, May 16.

The Winter's Tale *(WT)*

329. *WT.*—N. Y.: Limited Ed'ns Club, ils by A. Rutherston.

330. The ancestry of Autolycus.—W. T. Hastings.—SAB, 15: 253, Oct.

331. A classical vs. a social approach to Autolycus.—M. Y. Hughes.—SAB, 15: 219-26, Oct.

POETICS

332. The philosophy of poetry.—W. Hester.—The Personalist, 21: 61-72, Dec., 1939.

333. The nature of the lyric.—B. G. Brooks.—19th Century, 127: 78-86, Jan.

334. A course in poetics.—P. Valéry. (J. Mathews, tr.)—Southern R, 5: 401-18, Jan.

335. *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot.*—F. O. Matthiessen.—N. Y.: OUP, $1.50.

336. The source of poetry.—P. Engle.—College Engl, 1: 471-80, Mar.

337. On the semantics of poetry.—P. Wheelwright.—Kenyon R, 2: 263-83, July.

338. J. Bronowski's *The Poet's Defence.* J. B. Leishman.—RES, 16: 369-72, July.

339. *New Poets from Old: A Study in Literary Genetics.*—H. W. Wells.—N. Y.: Columbia U P, pp. xii + 356. $3.50.

340. Christian poetry.—L. Aaronson.—19th Century, 128: 182-88, Aug.

341. The value of poetry in the social order.—J. M. Murry.—Aryan Path, 11: 439-42, Sept.

342. Poetry & the passions.—E. E. Stoll. —PMLA, 55: 979-92, Dec.

343. *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden.* [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—N. Y.: Amer. Book Co, pp. xii + 704, bib, front., $4.

344. Keble on great poetry.—E. Lyttelton. —Hibbert J, 39: 74-82, Oct.

345. Understanding poetry.—B. Deutsch. —Amer. Scholar, 10: 67-71, Dec.

346. Romantic theories of poetry & criticism. [MS. diss.]—M. H. Abrams.—Harvard U.

347. The essence & function of poetry. [MS. diss.]—D. H. Kyes.—Poetry R, 31: 319-20, July.

348. Aspects of Tegnér's views concern-

ing poetry.—A. M. Sturtevant.—Scandinavian Studies, 16: 68-70, May.

349. Realism in Engl poetry.—V. de Sola Pinto.—*Essays & Studies . . . of the Engl Ass'n*, pp. 81-100.

POLITICS

350. *The State in Sh's Greek & Roman Plays.*—J. E. Phillips, Jr.—N. Y.: Columbia U P, pp. xii + 230, bib., $2.75. *See* 254.

PREDECESSORS

351. The authorship of *Gammer Gurton's Needle.*—C. W. Roberts.—PQ, 19: 97-113, Apr.

352. G. Scheuerwegh's ed'n of *Roister Doister.*—R. H. Bowers.—MLN, 55: 476-78, June.

PROSE

353. English prose style in trns from the classics, 1489-1580. [Ms. diss.]—J. L. Wortham.—Princeton U.

PUBLISHING

354. *'Ad imprimendum solum.'* — B: Shapin.—MLR, 35: 207-11, Apr.

QUARTOS

355. Sh quartos in collotype facs.—J. G. McManaway.—MLN, 55: 632-34, Dec.

RALEIGH, WALTER

356. Sir W. R. on natural philosophy.—E. A. Strathmann.—MLQ, 1: 49-61, Mar.

357. *The Hist of the World* and R's scepticism.—E. A. Strathmann.—HLQ, 3: 265-87, Apr.

358. W. R. in verse.—R. B. M.—Devon & Cornwall Notes & Queries, 21:41, Jan.

359. Venice & Engl political thought in the 17th century. — Z. S. Fink. — MP, 38: 155-72, Apr.

360. *R's Eden.* [A novel.]—I. Fletcher. —N. Y.: Bobbs-Merrill, $2.75.

361. W. R.'s farewell to his wife.—A: M. C. Latham.—*Essays & Studies . . . of the Engl Ass'n*, pp. 39-58.

RELIGION

362. The significance of religious writings in the Engl Renaissance.—L. B. Wright. —J of the Hist of Ideas, 1: 59-68, Jan.

363. The Eliz'n sermon: a survey & bibliography. [MS. diss.]—A. F. Herr.—U of Pa.

RUSSIA

364. Sh in the USSR.—J. Gury.—Amer. Q of the Soviet Union, 2: 45-59, July, 1939.

365. How we study Sh.—M. M. Morozov. —Sovietland, 9: 34, June.

RUTLAND-SH MATTER

366. *Sh Unmasked.*—P. S. Porohovshikov. —N. Y.; pp 304, 6 ils & 8 facss.

SCIENCE

367. Wm. Sh., botanist.—P: Cook.—SAB, 15: 149-65, July.

SIDNEY, PHILIP

368. Manuscripts of S's *Arcadia.*—M: Beese.—TLS, May 4, p. 224.

369. *The Defense of Poesie.* [With notes.] — A. H. Gilbert, ed. — *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden* (N. Y.: Amer. Book Co.), pp. 404-61.

370. The rhetoric of S's *Arcadia.* [MS. diss.]—P. McN. Miller, Jr.—Princeton U.

371. The influence of Plato on S's *Defense of Poesy.*—I. Samuel.—Modern Language Q, 1: 383-91, Sept.

SPENSER, EDMUND

372. Canto unity in *FQ.*—W. F. McNeir. —PQ, 19: 79-87, Jan.

373. Wordsworth's view on the state of Ireland.—E. W. Marjarum.—PMLA, 55: 608-11, June.

374. 'Hobgoblin runne away with the garland of Apollo.'—S. Thomas.—MLN, 55: 418-22, June.

375. Three imitations of Sp.—J. N. Hook.—MLN, 55: 431-32, June.

376. A. Fraunce & Sp. — K: Koller. — ELH, 7: 108-20, June.

377. E. K's reference to painting.—F. Hard.—ELH, 7: 121-29, June.

378. Keats & Sp again.—C. B. Burke.—PQ, 19: 149-50, Apr.

379. Sp's Malengin & the rogue-book Hooker.—B. Milligan.—PQ, 19: 147-48, Apr.

380. Sp & some pictorial conventions, with particular reference to illuminated manuscripts.—R. Tuve.—SP, 37: 149-76, Apr.

381. The allegory of Sir Artegall.—J: W. Bennett.—SP, 37: 177-200, Apr.

382. Ascham's *Scholemaster* & Sp's February Eclogue.—S. Rosenzweig.—SAB, 15: 103-09, Apr.

383. D. F. Atkinson's bibliography of Sp. —D. Hamer.—RES, 16: 338-40, July.

384. Queries fr Sp.—G. G. L.—NQ, 178: 445-46, June 22.

385. A study of Sp.—Viglione.—TLS, Apr. 13, p. 183.

386. Sp's brother-in-law.—W. H. Welply.—NQ, 179: 92-96 (Aug. 10), 112-14 (Aug. 17).

387. Sp's brother-in-law. — E. S. J. Brooks—NQ, 179: 139, Aug. 24.

388. The psychology of Anamnestes.—B. T. Stewart.—Modern Language Q, 1: 193-94, June.

389. *A Study of Sp's Gentleman.*—J. L. Shanley.—Evanston: The author.

390. Sp's 'House of Temperance.'—V. F. Hopper.—PMLA, 55: 958-67, Dec.

391. Letter to W. Raleigh [With notes.] —A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism,* pp. 462-65.

392. The background of *Prothalamion.* [MS. diss.]—D. S. Norton.—Princeton U.

393. Allegory & *FQ.* [Ms. diss.]—J. McClennen.—Harvard U.

394. The influence of Sp on Shelley's major poetry. [MS. diss.]—C. H. Baker. —Princeton U.

See 285.

STAGE HISTORY

395. *Annals of the N. Y. Stage.* [Vol. 12].—G. C. D. Odell.—N. Y.: Columbia UP., pp. xx + 734, 330 ils, $8.75.

See 3.

STAGING

396. Sh'n staging in London from Irving to Gielgud. [MS. diss.].—C. D. Linton. —Johns Hopkins U.

397. Some recent trends in Shn staging. —C. D. Linton.—ELH, 7: 300-24, Dec.

See 92, 274.

STRATFORD

398. John Sh, corvizer, of Stratford-on-Avon & the Balsall Shakespeares.—R. Taylor.—PMLA, 55: 721-26, Sept.

SUPERNATURAL

399. An examination of Sh's use of the supernatural. — C. Burcham — Research, Jan., 1939, pp. 14-32.

TEACHING

400. Use of phonographic recordings in teaching Sh.—S. Weingarten.—College Engl, 1: 45-61, Oct.. 1939.

401. How helpful are Sh recordings?—W. Ginsberg.—Engl J, 29: 289-300, Apr., 1940.

402. New methods in teaching Sh.—E. H. Sauer.—Ohio Schools, 18: 162-63, Apr., 1940.

403. Sh in primary schools.—Times Educational Suppl't, 1258: 229, June 10, 1939.

See 196.

TECHNIQUE

404. The use of rhyme in Sh's plays. [MS. diss., 1939.]—F. W. Ness.—Yale U.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

405. R. B. McKerrow's *Prolegomena for the Oxford Sh.*—J. B. Leishman; RES, 16: 92-95, Jan.—J. Wilcox; SAB, 15: 59-60, Jan.—R. W. Zandvoort; Engl Studies, 21: 169-71, Aug., 1939.

406. Standard emendations of Sh.—W. H. J.—NQ, 179: 388-89, Nov. 30.

TOURNEUR, CYRIL

407. C. T. & *The Transformed Metamorphosis.*—K. N. Cameron.—RES, 16: 18-24, Jan.

TRAGEDY

408. The shackling of accidents: a study of Eliz'n tragedy.—H. Craig.—PQ, 19: 1-19, Jan.

409. Tragedy.—U: Ellis-Fermor.—English, 3: 84-86, July.

410. *De l'art de la tragédie* by J. de la Taille; ed. by F. West.—B. Weinberg. —MP, 38: 216-17, Nov.

411. Various essays on tragedy, comedy & drama. [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism, passim.*

412. The theory of tragedy as history in renaissance & neo-classical criticism. [MS. diss.]—G. Giovannini.—U of Michigan.

VERSIFICATION

413. The grammar of rimes.—T. W. Herbert.—Sewanee R, 48: 362-77, July.
See 87, 122.

WEBSTER, JOHN

414. J. W.'s address to the reader in *The White Devil.* [With notes.]—A. H. Gilbert, ed.—*Literary Criticism,* p. 551.

WOMEN

415. A warning-piece against Sh's women. —A. M. Sampley.—SAB, 15: 34-39, Jan.

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

Occurring in the Bibliography of Elizabethan Topics for 1940*

Compiled by RALPH P. ROSENBERG

A

Aaronson, L., 340
Abrams, M. H., 346
Abstracts, 2
Acting and Actors, 75, 97, 100, 144, 150, 159
Adams, J. Q., 25, 208, 289, 317
Adaptations, 213
Adkins, M: G. M., 113
Aesthetics, 107, 332-49
Aiken, J: R., 174
Alexander, P., 235
Allegory, 381, 393
All's Well, 218
Alspach, R. K., 248
America, Sh and, 3-4, 152, 323, 325
Angell, P: K., 303
Angelo, V., 255
Anthology, 5
Antony, A. G., 45
Antony and Cleopatra, 41, 219-20, 350
Apocrypha, 6
Ariosto, Ludovico, 104
Arnold, O., 42
Artegall, Sir, 381
Arther, J. 17
Ascham, Roger, 382
Ash, M: 254
As You Like It, 52, 221-23, 300
Atheism, 177
Atkinson, B., 325
Atkinson, D. F., 383
Atkinson, J. B., 265
Authorship problems, 7-8, 29, 90, 310, 319

B

Bacon, Francis, 9-11
Bacon-Sh imbroglio, 12-15, 28, 29
Bacon, W. A., 76
Bajocchi, F., 270
Baker, C. H., 394
Baker, H., 69
Baldwin, T. W., 64, 70, 303
Bale, John, 16-17
Barmudas, A Discovery of the, 317
Barrell, C. W., 214-15
Bartlett, H: C., 25
Bates, S: C., 40
Baudelaire, Charles, 138
Baugh, A. C., 24
Baym, M. I., 138
Beaumont and Fletcher, 18-19
Beer, E. S. de, 81
Beese, M., 368
Bennett, J: W., 381
Bennett, R. E., 117
Berg, Y., 226
Bible, 20-21, 281
Bibliography, 22-27, 64, 82, 89, 94, 139, 175, 176, 185, 262, 301, 363, 383
Binder, R., 220
Biography, 28-37, 62, 304, 398
Birds, 36, 37
Blundeville, T., 108
Boas, F. S., 179, 182
Bodin, Jean, 162
Bonjour, A., 246
Book titles from Sh, 38-57
Botany, Sh and, 367
Boughner, D. C., 268
Bourland, C: B., 148, 233
Bowen, E. W., 137
Bowers, D: 54
Bowers, F. T., 91, 98
Bowers, R. H., 352
Boyd, M. C., 207
Boydell Sh, The, 199
Brenton, E: S., 310
Breton, Nicholas, 58
Breton, William, 58
Bright, T., 190

*Women's names are distinguished by a colon after the baptismal name. Sh = Shakspere.

Brissaud, P., 327
Bronowski, J., 338
Brooke, T., 306
Brooks, B. G., 333
Brooks, E. S. J., 387
Brooks, P., 197, 200
Brophy, J., 135
Brown, D., 225
Brown, J. L., 162
Brown, J. M., 325
Brown, M: 116
Bryant, M: M., 174
Buday, G., 318
Buffum, I., 205
Bulgaria, Sh and, 313
Bullough, G., 146
Burcham, C., 399
Burke, C. B., 378
Burt, K: B., 49
Burton, Robert, 136

C

C, T C, 144
Cabell, B., 228
Cadwalader, J., 6
Cameron, E: 55
Cameron, K. N., 407
Campbell, L: B., 102
Campbell, O. J., 216, 322
Campion, E., 155
Canada, Medieval and Renaissance manuscripts in, 22
Carew, Thomas, 212
Carnevali, F., 324
Carrick, E: 146
Castelnuovo-Tedesco, M., 210
Censorinus, 221
Chamberlain, J., 79
Chambers, E. K., 34
Chapman, George, 59
Charles II, 165
Charlot, J., 250
Charlton, H. B., 296
Chester, Robert, 85
China, Sh and, 8
Chinese philosophy, 8
Chronicle history, 168
Clark, E: T., 125, 276
Clarkson, P. S., 273
Classics, 157, 353
Classics, Sh's knowledge of, 125
Coleridge, Samuel T., 74
Coles, B: 252
Comedy, 60-61, 411
Comedy of Errors, 44, 192, 224
Commedia dell'arte, 268
Commentary, 31, 35, 62-77
Contemporaries, 78-86
Contemporary drama, 27, 34, 87-101
Contemporary poetry, 102-07
Contemporary prose, 108-10
Contemporary setting, 263, 274
Cook, P: 367
Cooper, James F., 152
Copyhold tenure, 273
Corbin, J., 73
Coriolanus, 225, 350
Craig, H., 26, 190, 235, 408
Craig, H. S., 124
Credulity, 130
Criticism, 75
Crundell, H. W., 184
Cunningham, W. McC., 13
Curry, W. C., 70
Cymbeline, 63, 226

D

Daniels, R. B., 105
Da Porto, Luigi, 299
Dark Lady, 303
Davenant, William, 107, 111-12
Davis, B. E. C., 146
Dekker, Thomas, 113-14
De Ricci, S., 22
Derrick, L. E., 266
Deutsch, B., 345
Dick, H. G., 88, 108
Dictionaries, 170
Dodds, M. H., 20, 30, 144
Donne, John, 106, 115-22
Doran, M: 130
Dottridge, G., 155a
Drake, Sir Francis, 86
Drama, 66, 67, 68, 87-101, 122, 213, 411
Drama, Annals of English, 27
Dramatic rhythm 220

Dramatic romances, Sh's, 76
Dramatic technique, 240, 246, 288
Draper, J. W., 227, 261, 278, 288a, 321
Drayton, Michael, 123, 160, 163
Dryden, John, 106, 119, 343
Du Bois, A. E., 61
Dueling, 124
Du Maurier, A: 50
Dwiggins, W. A., 309

E

Eccles, M., 19
Education, 125
Edward II, 184
Edwards, A. C., 147
Eichenberg, F., 294
Einarsson, S., 1
Eliot, S. A., Jr., 159
Eliot, Thomas S., 335
Elisabeth, Queen, 126
Ellis-Fermor U: 179, 409
Emendations, *See* Textual criticism
Engle, P., 336
Ennis, L: 83
Environment, 127-34
Eshleman, L., 228
Evans, G. B., 112
Evans, Maurice, 325
Ewen, C. L. E., 32
Ewing, S. B., 130

F

Facsimiles, 35, 109, 155, 190, 258, 277, 282, 290, 317, 355
Falk, R. P., 4
Farjeon, H., 218, 226, 249, 250, 284, 291, 293-94, 298, 309, 316, 318, 320, 327
Fatout, P., 65
Faust Book, 178
Ferguson, W. K., 131
Fiction, 275, 360
Fictionised, 135, 228
Finch, M. E., 241
Fink, Z. S., 359
Fitzsimmons, C., 57
Fletcher, I., 360
Fletcher, John, 18-19
Floethe, R., 218
Flournay, F., 58
Folio, First, 197, 200, 229
Fools in Sh, 63
Ford, John, 96, 136
Forgeries, 6, 28, 86, 137, 183
Frame, D. M., 206
France, Sh and, 138-39, 254, 256
Fraunce, A., 376
Funke, O., 161

G

Gammer Gurton's Needle, 351
Garrick, David, 75
Gascoigne, George, 58, 140
Gasper, P. A., 253, 315
Gassner, J., 67, 93
Gentleman, Spenser's, 389
Geography in Sh, 224, 317
Germany, Sh and, 141-42a, 257
Ghosts, 143-44
Gielgud, John, 396
Gilbert, A. H., 59, 150, 166, 188, 221, 343, 369, 391, 411, 414
Gill, W. W., 297
Ginsberg, W., 401
Giordano-Orsini, G. N., 271
Giovannini,G., 412
Glunz, H. H., 239
Gómara, F. L. de, 109
Goodacre, E. B., 8, 85
Gordon, C. H., 281
Gorrell, R. M., 99
Gottfried, R. B., 155
Graham, P. G., 257
Grain engrossers, 201
Grammar, 19, 161, 413
Greek, Sh's knowledge of, 125
Greek plays, Sh's, 350
Greene, Robert, 145, 182
Greet, B., 194
Greg, W. W., 25, 94, 232, 259, 260, 263, 289
Grégoire, H., 313
Greville, Fulke, 146-47
Gronauer, G., 143
Grubbs, H. A., 164
Guérard, A., 68
Guiterman, A., 237
Gulls in Sh, 63
Gury, J., 364

H

H, F. E. C., 292
Hale, J. P., 42
Hamer, D., 383
Hamlet, 38, 47, 57a, 63, 71, 227-46, 399
Harbage, A., 27, 96
Hard, F., 377
Hardy, Thomas, 151
Harington, John, 104
Harris, J. W., 16
Harrison, G. B., 2, 97
Harvey, Gabriel, 84, 148
Hastings, W. T., 330
Haug, R. A., 319
Hayes, Helen, 325
Healy, T. F., 154
Hebbel, Friedrich, 257
Henderson, W. B. D., 256
Henry IV, 247-48
Henry V, 171, 249
Henry VI, 250
Henshaw, M., 24
Herbert, T. W., 413
Herod and Mariamne tragedies, 87
Heron-Allen, E., 14
Herr, A. F., 173, 363
Herrick, Robert, 107, 149, 157
Hester, W., 332
Heywood, Thomas, 150
Hinman, C., 114
Hinton, E. M., 80
Hobman, D: L., 275
Holland, Philemon, 82
Holmes, H. H., 51
Hook, J. N., 375
Hopper, V. F., 390
Horses, Sh's allusions to, 65
Houghton, R. E. C., 60
Houk, R. A., 307
Hudson, H. H., 102
Hughes, M. Y., 331
Huhner, M., 191
Humanism, 134
Hutchinson, P., 179
Hyma, A., 134

I

Iceland, Sh and, 1
Illuminated manuscripts, 380
Illustrations, 326
Imitations, Spenser, 375
Influence, 134, 136, 145, 151-53, 157, 162, 164, 286, 359, 371, 394
Innes, M., 44
Ireland, 373
Ireland, Sh and, 154-56
Irving, Henry, 396
Italy, Sh and, 156, 299

J

J, W. H., 406
Jaggard, W., 8, 33, 180
Jews, 275
Johnson, P: H., 48
Jonas, L: 107
Jones, Inigo, 81
Jones, O. F., 142a
Jones, Robert, 208
Jonson, Ben, 97, 107, 157-67
Jordan, E: 325
Jourdain, Sylvester, 317
Julius Caesar, 57, 251-53, 350, 399

K

K, E., 377
K, H. G. L., 144
Kahin, H: A., 287
Kastendieck, M. M., 212
Keats, John, 378
Keble, John, 344
Keller, I. C., 203
Kepler, Johannes, 118
King, A. H., 314
King John, 42, 254-255
King Lear, 46, 50, 90, 256-67
Kirschbaum, L., 240
Knights, L. C., 244
Kocher, P. H., 177-78, 181
Kohn, H., 129
Koller, K: 376
Kredel, F., 284
Kuzmin, M. A., 308
Kyd, Thomas, 168-69
Kyes, D. H., 347

L

L., G. G., 384
Landrum, G: W., 198
Language, 170-74, 264, 337
Lapshin, N. F., 320
Latham, A: M. C., 361
Law, R. A., 227
Leavis, F. R., 74
Le Brun collection of Montaigne, 205
Leech, C., 165, 187
Leishman, J. B., 338, 405
Letters, 79, 117, 183, 391
Lewis, R. B., 35
Limited Editions Club's Sh, 226, 249-50, 255, 284, 291, 293-94, 298, 309, 316, 318, 321, 324, 327, 329
Linton, C. D., 396-97
Loane, G. G., 149, 328
Lockridge, R., 325
Lodge, Thomas, 97, 175
Lord Chamberlain's Company, The, 159
Love's Labor's Lost, 268-69
Luedeke, H., 306
Lyly, John, 176
Lyman, D. B., 219
Lyttelton, E., 344

M

M., R. B., 358
Macbeth, 45, 51, 54-56, 270-74, 399
Machiavelli, Niccolo, 156, 182
Macurdy, G: 43
Malengin, 379
Manuscripts, 22, 368, 380
Marjarum, E. W., 373
Mark, M., 66
Marlowe, Christopher, 97, 177-84
Marston, John, 185
Martin, B., 247
Marx, M., 122
Massinger, Philip, 186-89
Masuccio, 299
Mathews, J., 334
Matthiessen, F. O., 335
Maynard, T., 126
McClennen, J., 393
McCloskey, J. C., 312
McClure, N. E., 79
McEuen, K: A., 157
McKerrow, R. B., 102, 128, 405
McManaway, J. G., 111, 355
McNeal, T. H., 145
McNeely, S. S., 110
McNeir, W. F., 372
McQuigg, K. D., 155a
Medicine, 190-93
Medieval manuscripts, 22
Melsome, W. S., 12
Merchant of Venice, 40, 43, 275-81
Merry Wives of Windsor, 63, 282
Metaphysical poetry, 119
Metzl, E., 298
Meyerstein, E. H. W., 183
Michelmore, G. W., 194
Middle-class culture, 127
Midsummer Night's Dream, 283
Miles, L. W., 77
Miller, D. C., 283
Miller, P. McN., Jr., 370
Millican, C. B., 127
Milligan, B., 95, 201, 379
Miscellanea, 194-204
Mitchell, R: C., 56
Mizener, A., 21, 302
Montaigne, Michel de, 205-06, 256
Mooney, E. A., Jr., 153
Moore, H. T., 202
Moore, O. H., 299
Morozov, M. M., 365
Motherwell, 18
Mouse-trap, 232, 234, 245
Much Ado About Nothing, 284-85
Müller, J., 141
Muller, D. C., 288
Murry, J. M., 341
Music, 207-13

N

Names in Sh, 223
Nationalism, 129
Natural philosophy, 356
Ness, F. W., 404
Newfoundland, Sh and, 172
New School for Social Research, 265
Nichols, M: G., 46
Nicolson, M: 118

Nixon, A., 83
Norton, D. S., 392
Nosworthy, J. M., 101, 245, 267

O

Odell, G. C. D., 395
Old age in Sh, 77, 261
Olmsted, S. P., 311
Orthography, 30, 32, 33, 114
Ostoja-Chrostowski, S., 291
Othello, 63, 71, 286-88a.
Oxford and Bacon, 10
Oxford Sh, 405
Oxford-Sh Theory, 214-16

P

Paine, G., 24
Parker, A. M., 293
Parks, G. B., 224
Parrott, T. M., 235
Passionate Pilgrim, 289-90
Pattison, B., 212
Peele, George, 183, 217-17a
Pericles, 291
Perkins, W., 78
Perkinson, R. H., 158
Phillips, D. E., 72
Phillips, J. E., 350
Philosophy, 70
Phonograph recordings, 202, 400-01
Pinto, V. de S., 84, 349
Plagiarism, 83
Plato, 343, 371
Plays, 218-88, 291-99, 307-27, 329-31
Poems, 289-90, 300-06, 328
Poetics, 332-49, 369-72
Poetry, 119-20, 394
Politics, 156, 254, 263, 350, 359
Pool, R. M., 192
Popov, A., 308
Popular literature, 110
Porohovshikov, P. S., 7, 10, 366
Porter, Henry, 101
Potter, G. R., 115
Prance, C. R., 86
Pratt, M. B., 305
Predecessors, 351-52
Price, H. T., 171
Priestley, H. I., 109
Prior, M. E., 242
Producing Sh, *See* Staging
Prose, 353
Prouty, C. T., 140
Psychology, 174, 278, 320
Publishing, 354
Puritanism, 113

Q

Quartos, Sh, 25, 355
Queen Elizabeth, 126

R

Raleigh, Walter, 356-61, 391
Randall, J. H., 11
Ray, P. C., 29
Recordings, Sh, 202, 400-01
Red Bull Theatre, 92
Reed, I., 217
Reese, M. M., 133
Reformation, 16
Religion, 17, 78, 362-63
Renaissance bibliography, 26
Renaissance dictionaries, 170
Renaissance manuscripts, 22
Revenge tragedy, 91, 98
Reynolds, G. F., 92
Reynolds, J. L., 52, 300
Reznikoff, C., 280
Rhyme, 404, 413
Richard II, 49, 292-93
Richard III, 294-95, 399
Rick, T., 104
Roaring boy in Tudor and Stuart literature, 95
Roberts, C. W., 351
Roister Doister, 352
Rollins, H. E., 290
Roman plays, Sh's, 350
Romeo and Juliet, 173, 198, 296-99
Rosenberg, R. P., 23
Rosenzweig, S., 382
Ross, W., 304
Rousseau, Jean-B, 164
Rulfs, D. J., 100
Russia, Sh and, 308, 364-65
Rutherston, A., 329

Rutland-Sh matter, 366
Rych, Barnabe, 80
Ryland, G., 5

S

Sampley, A. M., 415
Samuel,I., 371
Satire, 201
Sauer, E. H., 402
Scepticism, 121, 357
Schell, J. S., 63
Schenck, E., 53
Scheuerwegh, G., 352
Schmidt, W., 322
Schücking, L., 242
Science, 367
Sear, H. G., 209
Sears, B. E., 5
Sen, T., 236
Senob, A: 189
Sermons, Elizabethan, 363
Seton-Anderson, J., 33
Seymour, J. L., 213
Shaaber, M. A., 248a
Shackley, M. S., 3
Shadwell, Thomas, 112
Sh tour, 195
Shanley, J. L., 389
Shapin, B: 354
Sharpe, R. L., 106, 119
Shelley, Percy B., 280, 394
Short, R. W., 160
Sidney, Philip, 368-71
Silvette, H., 82
Simon, H. W., 279
Simpson, H: 47
Simpson, P., 163
Sisson, C. J., 62, 234
Slade, F. E., 204
Sledd, J., 264
Smith, G., 193
Smith, J., 222
Smith, R. M., 31
Social themes, 167
Songs, 300
Sonnets, 39, 48, 145, 301-06
Sources, 280, 299, 313
Spencer, H., 31, 62, 98
Spenser, Edmund, 285, 372-94
Stage history, 3, 266, 395
Staging, 3, 81, 92, 144, 259, 265, 323, 325, 396-97
Stainer, C. L., 229
Stalker, A., 28
Starnes, D. T., 170
Stewart, B. T., 388
Stewart, C. D., 243
Stockelbach, L: 37
Stoll, E. E., 71, 73, 342
Stone, G. W., Jr., 75
Strange, M: 41
Stratford, 398
Strathmann, E. A., 356-57
Stunz, A. N., 274
Sturtevant, A. M., 348
Supernatural, 399
Surname, Sh's, 30
Symons, J., 167

T

Taille, J. de la, 410
Taming of the Shrew, 307-11
Tannenbaum, S. A., 23, 175, 176, 185, 217a, 223, 230-31, 238, 262, 289, 301, 325
Taylor, R., 398
Teaching, 141, 196, 334, 400-03
Technique, 311, 404
Tegnér, Esaias, 348
Tempest, The, 53, 152-53, 312-17, 399
Tennyson, Alfred, 153
Textual criticism, 114, 120, 230-31, 238, 267a-b, 269, 272, 405-06
Thaler, A., 69, 285, 322
Theobald, L., 6
Thomas, S., 374
Thompson, D. W., 272
Thompson, L., 199
Thompson, O., 211
Tillotson, G., 123
Tillotson, K: 163
Timon of Athens, 318-20, 350
Titus Andronicus, 321
Tomkinson, G: 172
Tomkis, John, 88
Tong epitaph and Sh, 8
Tourneur, Cyril, 407

Tragedy, 69, 87, 91, 98, 122, 147, 296, 408-13
Translations, 35, 104, 142a, 308, 353
Traversi, D. A., 156
Troilus and Cressida, 322, 350
Tuve, R., 380
Twelfth Night, 63, 192, 323-26, 366
Twins and twinning, Sh's knowledge of, 192
Two Gentlemen of Verona, 327
Tyson, I: 196

U

United States, Medieval and Renaissance manuscripts in, 22
Urbanovich, P., 308

V

Valency, M. J., 87
Valéry, P., 334
Van Druten, J., 38
Vandiver, E. P., Jr., 152
Variorum editions, 248a
Venetian justice, 158
Venus and Adonis, 328
Versification, 87, 122, 413
Viglione, 385

W

Walker, A: 322
Walsh, G., 192
Walters, M: 9
Warren, C. T., 273
Warton, Thomas, 217
Wasserman, E. R., 18, 103
Watson, S: R., 286
Watts, R., Jr., 265
Weber, C. J., 151
Webster Groves High School, 323
Webster, John, 414
Weinberg, B., 410
Weingarten, S., 400
Weisgard, L., 300
Wells, H. W., 89, 339
Wells, S. B., 269
Wells, W., 90, 168, 169
Welply, W. H., 386
West, F., 410
Whately, Anne, 304
Wheelwright, P., 337
White, F. C., 33
Whitstone, George, 102
Wilcox, J., 405
Wiley, M: L., 121
Will, S. F., 139
Will, Sh's, 28
Williams College, 197, 200
Williams, F. B., 128
Williamson, G., 120
Willoughby, V: 249
Wilson, E. A., 316
Wilson, J. D., 132, 292
Wilson, R. H., 217
Wilson, W. J., 22
Winter's Tale, The, 329-31
Witchcraft, 181
Women, 415
Wordsworth, William, 373
Wortham, J. L., 353
Wright, G. W., 15
Wright, L. B., 78, 127, 362

Z

Zandvoort, R. W., 251, 405
Zeeveld, W. G., 295

Brooklyn and Hunter Colleges (Ext. Div.)

IN DEFENSE OF BASSANIO

By J. M. Ariail

IN her article, Bassanio the Elizabethan Lover,[1] Miss Helen Pettigrew has prefaced her thesis with an adequate summary of the "accusatory chorus" of scholars who have expressed the feeling of the inferiority of Bassanio to Portia. Notwithstanding her purpose to show that Bassanio is clearly intended for the hero of the play, and that he is a realistic Elizabethan gentleman, quite worthy of the noble Portia, the author admits that Bassanio's behavior, for a hero, does seem rather odd, and she proceeds to enumerate sufficient weaknesses to leave him upon a pretty low level. In thus joining the detractors of Bassanio, Miss Pettigrew makes more striking and effective her restoration and elevation of the lover, but in her zeal for her idea she does unwarrantable violence to the text and reduces Bassanio to a level of degradation that is unfair to him, and from which not even Shakspere could lift him.

Miss Pettigrew says: "As a husband, Bassanio's only acts are to use Portia's money as freely as his own, and later to break word with her, and then to lie about the ring." In Bassanio's defense I wish to examine this statement in the light of the text of the play.

Whatever may have been the motives of Bassanio as he planned his wooing and before he saw Portia, it is clear that after he came into her presence he was genuinely in love.

When Portia says:

> "Then confess
> What treason there is mingled with your love,"

he replies:

> "None but that ugly treason of mistrust
> Which makes me fear the enjoying of my love."
>
> " 'Confess' and 'love'
> Had been the very sum of my confession."

In the casket scene, his bitter speech on gold reveals a changed motive and may have been intended in part to indicate such a change. When he has won, it is Portia who, in one of her loveliest speeches, wishes herself a thousand times more fair and ten thousand times more rich for his sake, and reminds him that her house and her possessions are all his. In reply to this, Bassanio declares that she has bereft him of all words and left only joy, but in expressing this he does not refer to the gift of worldly goods. Apparently, then, these things are no longer as they were at the beginning of the quest.

When, a little later in the same scene, ill news comes from Antonio, Bassanio turns pale with grief and shock, but there is no word that hints that he sees, even in a flash of thought or an aside, any way out with Portia's money. In fact, he steps apart to read the letter and seems to make a sincere effort to keep Portia from learning its contents. In response to her charming plea to know the trouble he frankly states his poverty and explains thereby the loan, but there is not the slightest suggestion that her or their money should repay it. Indeed, before such a thought could form Salerio heads it off by stating that the Jew would not take the money if Antonio had it, and this is emphatically confirmed by Jessica.

When Portia, by direct inquiry, learns the amount of money due, it is she who says:

> "Pay him six thousand, and deface the bond.
> Double six thousand and then treble that
> Before a friend of this description
> Shall lose a hair through Bassanio's fault.
> First go with me to church and call me wife,
> And then away to Venice to your friend!
>
> You shall have gold
> To pay the petty debt twenty times over.
> When it is paid bring your true friend along."

Undoubtedly, Bassanio took the money along, for Portia checks on it several times during the court scene. True, he offers "thrice" the debt, but this is far less than Portia instructed him to offer. He attempts to give the Civil Doctor

the amount of the original bond, which if taken might have been repaid by Antonio, who had by this time the refusal of one-half of Shylock's wealth. There is no evidence further in the play that Bassanio did not return the unspent money or that he ever spent Portia's money "freely" or even at all. Miss Pettigrew's first charge, then, is not only not substantiated by the text but also fails to do justice to one of Portia's loveliest moments by taking from her generous nature the lead in the whole money relationship.

As to the charge that Bassanio broke his word to Portia, there can be no dispute. But the manner in which he did it cannot be treated aside from the text. If ever a man tried to keep faith in a tight spot it was Bassanio. He confesses the truth that the ring is his wife's gift and reveals his vow. He holds out until Antonio's plea that the ring be given "against his wife's commandment." He insists that the gift was "enforced"—by friendship and by honor—thereby tacitly refusing to admit that he had broken faith. Surely, if a man ever kept the spirit of his word with his wife it was he.

The final charge made by Miss Pettigrew—"to lie about the ring"—I feel is entirely unsubstantiated by the text. Yet she rather insists upon this, saying: "The ring episode, too, occurs in *Il Pecorone,* but there only one ring is involved, and the hero does not attempt, when charged with having given his ring away, to prevaricate." "Shakespeare, then, added to his source nearly all of Bassanio's distinctive characteristics, unpleasant and otherwise"—among the former the characteristic of lying.

I confess I cannot find one slight deviation from the truth, either in fact or in spirit, in the words of Bassanio from the moment when Portia asks, "What ring gave you, my Lord," until he speaks his last words in the play. True, his first impulse is to prevaricate.

> "Why I were best to cut my left hand off
> And swear I lost the ring defending it."

But he does not do it. He says, simply and honestly:

"If I could add a lie unto a fault,
I would deny it; but you see my finger
Hath not the ring upon it — it is gone."

And then follows the simple truth, corroborated by the serious and sincere Antonio.

Miss Pettigrew's article is important and highly interesting, but the ablest thesis is weakened if Shakspere's words do not support the cause. Unquestionably, Bassanio suffers enough in contrast with the incomparable Portia. But may we not say at this period of his work Shakspere was more interested in his heroines than in their lovers, and that he isolates them and concentrates upon them frequently at the expense of the latter? Romeo crumples up and becomes a poor sport just as Juliet takes the lead; Orlando is scarcely a worthy match for Rosalind; Beatrice has depths unfathomed by the shallow Benedict, and Olivia is surrounded by a troop of sorry fellows. Bassanio, not quite so unworthy as Miss Pettigrew makes him, fares fairly well—but apparently Shakspere was more interested in Portia.

Columbia College,
South Carolina.

[1]Helen Pettigrew: "Bassanio the Elizabethan Lover." *P. Q.*, XVI (July, 1937), pp. 296-306.

I KNOW A HAWK FROM A HANDSAW

By HALDEEN BRADDY

AMONG the wild and whirling words that young Prince Hamlet employs to mystify his auditors and convince them of his madness, none is more puzzling than in Act II, scene ii, lines 360-61: "I am but mad north-north-west; when the wind is southerly, I know a hawk from a handsaw." Although Hamlet's allusion to the "hawk" and the "handsaw" seems perfectly admissible in implying that he is discerning in being able to distinguish one object (a bird) from another (a carpenter's tool), Shaksperian scholars in general have not been inclined to accept the statement at face value. Before attempting to treat the problem from a fresh angle, it may be well to review, from notes in the Furness Variorum[1] the interpretations which have won attention.

In 1744 Hanmer suggested emending "handsaw"[2] to "heronsew, -shew, -shaw," in order that the expression might read "I know a hawk from a hernshaw," *i.e.,* a hawk from a heron. This reading has received wide recognition and is approved by some editors of the present day; but unfortunately for those critics who would have the hawk symbolize the north wind and the heron the south wind, or have the passage relate to the behaviour of the birds in the sport of falconry,[3] this suggested emendation is not supported by such evidence as would warrant acceptance. The words "handsaw" and "hernshaw" appear to be without any etymological relation whatever. The inappropriateness of this emendation was, indeed, recognized by a few early commentators; but—again unfortunately—at least one or two of these who accepted "handsaw" felt obliged to conjecture, with reference to "hawk," that there was in Elizabethan England a hooked cutting tool called a hawk. But this can hardy be established; the *New English Dictionary* records no instance of this meaning for "hawk" before the year 1700.

Hamlet's statement makes good sense as it stands, and thus would appear altogether satisfactory, especially since

there seems to be no conclusive datum to the contrary. In point of fact, there are in the Anglo-Saxon language[4] proverbial phrases markedly similar to the Prince's claim that he knows "a hawk from a handsaw." Perhaps the most surprising feature of Hamlet's wording is the choice of the affirmative or positive;[5] for these old saws are most frequently in the negative. When in the negative these antique sayings are generally euphemisms for stupidity. Examples may be cited from sources ready at hand:

1. I know not an A from the Windmylne (year 1401, *NED*).
2. He does not know a great A from the gable end of a house (1830, Apperson).[6]
3. I know not . . . a B from a bole foot (1401, *NED*).
4. He . . . knewe not a letter, or a B from a bateldore (1565, Apperson).
5. Hardly one of them could tell J from a bandy stick (late 19th cent.).[7]

Then there are numerous similar phrases in current speech:

6. He don't know beef from bull's foot.[8]
7. He doesn't know a woodcock from a turkey.
8. He don't know a hog from a side-saddle.
9. He don't know his foot from a hole in the ground.[9]
10 I didn't know him from Adam's off-ox.[10]

And Apperson[11] adds the following variations of Hamlet's own words:

11. He knows not a hawk from a handsaw (1703, Centlivre, *Stolen Heiress,* III, iv).
12. I have heard the proverb, 'He doesn't know a hawk from a handsaw' (1912, R. L. Gales, *Studies in Arcady,* 2d ser., 24).
13. I suspect 'Charlie' . . . could not tell a hawk from a handsaw, even when the wind was southerly (1920, Barbellion, *Last Diary,* 54).

There appears ample reason to conclude that Hamlet's wording belongs to the same genre as the foregoing proverbial sayings and that it should be interpreted as it is written: "I know a hawk from a handsaw." But it might be argued that inasmuch as "he don't know beef from bull's foot" seems to be a corruption of "I know not . . . a B from

a bole foot," similarly "I know a hawk from a handsaw" is a corruption of "I know a hawk from a hernshaw." However, the fact is that there appears to be no instance of "I know a hawk from a heronsew" as a proverbial saying. "Heronsew" thus appears an entirely unwarranted emendation. But even if a phrase linking *hawk* with *heronsew* should be found, this would by no means affect the important circumstance that Shakspere wrote and meant "handsaw," just as today one says and means "beef," not "B." Hamlet is not completely mad; when the wind is southerly (*i.e.,* when the time is propitious),[12] he is discerning: he knows "a hawk from a handsaw," precisely as one today knows a "hog from a side-saddle."

Shakspere is so fond of puns and involved word-play, even to the extent of double and triple punning, that the student gleans little from these realms of gold when reading only literally. With evidence now at hand that the passage involves handsaw, the earlier interpretations based on hernshaw obviously must be forsaken; but this does not remove the theory held by some that in Hamlet's wild words there is a so-called hidden meaning. What, then, is the meaning of the Prince?

In this connection, it will be recalled that Hamlet is discussing with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern matters relating to the players who are to perform in Elsinore. Rosencrantz explains that "an aerie [a nest of hawks] of children, little eyases" [young hawks; *i.e.,* unfledged novices] are challenging the popularity of the "common players." Now, it is possible that "handsaw," a common tool, links in some way with "common players" and also with "Your hands," Hamlet's words of greeting to the "common players"; certainly the word "hawk" might easily refer to "an aerie" and "little eyases."

However this may be, one point is clear: Hamlet is suspicious of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern; he recognizes that they are spies, because in an "aside" he says: "I have an eye of you." It accordingly seems not at all unnatural to associate Rosencrantz and Guildenstern with the well-recognized figurative meaning of hawk; namely, a person

who preys or spies upon another. But what does "handsaw" mean? One may reply by observing that as Hamlet is speaking Polonius enters and launches into one of his wordy discourses, becoming as echolalic as a handsaw. After hearing Polonius speak only three short lines, Prince Hamlet exclaims: "Buz, buz!"

Hamlet clearly sought to astonish his hearers, but Shakspere doubtless did not desire to mystify his listeners. In stating that "I am but mad north-north-west; when the wind is southerly, I know a hawk from a handsaw," Hamlet would appear to imply that he was not as stupid as his auditors seemed to believe, that when their subterfuges were so baldly plain, he at least could detect a spying *hawk* from an old man as full of "buzzes" as a *handsaw.*

Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas.

---

[1]Pages 170-71.

[2]"Handsaw" is of course acceptable wording: "Hondsawe" occurs as early as 1411 (see *NED*), and the word appears elsewhere in Shakspere (*e.g.,* 1 *Hy,* IV, iv, 187.

[3]See the remarks by Furness.

[4]In the Argentine epic, *The Gaucho Martin Fierro* (New York, 1936), a "darkey" states that he does "not know the O, because it is round" (*no conocer la O por redonda*), which translator Walter Owen renders as "I don't know J from O."

[5]The statement is usually negative according to Eric Partridge, *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (New York, 1937, p. 380).

[6]G. L. Apperson, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases* (New York, 1929).

[7]John C. Duval, *The Adventures of Big-Foot Wallace,* ed. M. Major and R. W. Smith (Dallas, 1936), p. 290, n. 3.

[8]Haldeen Braddy, "Tall Talk of the Texas Trans-Pecos," *American Speech* (April, 1940), XV, 221.

[9]There is a variant of this in obscene language.

[10]Other similar sayings from current speech might be adduced, but the reader is doubtless familiar enough with this type of proverbial phrase.

[11]Pages 290-91.

[12]Apparently it is an old belief that people forget courtly manners and behave according to their natural feeings when the south wind blows; see the famous novel by Norman Douglas: *South Wind.*

SHAKSPERE'S DUKES

By CURTIS B. WATSON

I.

SHAKSPERE'S Dukes, when considered as a group (excluding those in the English history plays) perform a surprisingly uniform function in the plots of the eight comedies and two tragedies in which they appear. This is of particular interest because the relationship which the Dukes bear to the structure of Shakspere's plots is not present in any of the plays of his chief predecessors, Lyly, Greene, Peele, Nash, Lodge, Kyd and Marlowe, or in any of the more important anonymous plays from the period before Shakspere. Nor is it present in any but a few of the Italian novelle, the sources of so many Elizabethan plays, if the tales in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure,* the chief Elizabethan collection in translation, can be taken as representative. Apparently it is an element of plot construction original with Shakspere, whose usual lack of originality in the matter of plot is notorious.

What is this function? In brief, it is the presence of the Duke either at the beginning or end of a main plot of the play; his presence being in his official capacity as head of the state. When he appears in this way at the opening of a plot, he performs some act of state which brings about the conflict involving the chief characters. Thus, in the first scene of *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* Duke Theseus decrees that Hermia must choose between marrying the man of her father's choice, Demetrius, and taking the alternative penalties of a life of chastity as a nun or death as provided for disobedient daughters by Athenian law. This sets the main plot in motion. Lysander and Hermia flee to the woods where the ensuing action of the play takes place.

At the end of a play the rôle of the Duke is threefold: he acts to resolve the conflict in the interests of justice; he grants mercy to the offenders; and finally he plays the host at the festivities which are presumably to follow on the successful resolution of the dramatic conflict. Thus at the

end of *Measure for Measure* the Duke establishes justice in the conflict between Angelo and Isabella and then grants mercy to a presumably repentant Angelo. And the whole last act of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* provides an extended example of the Duke fulfilling the rôle of host.

Two objections may occur to the reader in regard to these generalizations. How can any one find a typically Shaksperian feature of plot structure when his plots are usually dependent on a source? Again, how can one generalize about the Duke as a type when in so many cases he is an individualized character? I believe both objections may be answered. It is true that most of the plays with Dukes have plots taken from one or more sources. But in almost every case Shakspere either modifies or adds to his source in the particular way in which he puts his Duke into his plot. And in regard to the second objection, I hope to show that even they serve this peculiarly Shaksperian function which is the only excuse dramatically for the existence of the uncharacterized Dukes.[1]

An examination of the characteristics of the Duke in the rôle which I have suggested he performs shows certain qualities which the Dukes have in common. These qualities are connected with the duties they serve in their official capacities at the beginning and end of the plot. Therefore, though the Duke may be called a type character, the qualities which distinguish him, unlike those of the bragging soldier, for instance, are a direct result of his function in the plot. For the sake of convenience, however, I shall hereafter refer to the Duke as a "type Duke", meaning by this any Duke when he is serving the rôle of representative of the State or when he acts in a manner fitting in tone that of the close of a comedy—as the granting of mercy or the suggesting of a festive celebration.

One of the chief uses to which the type Duke is put is the maintenance of the laws of the state. Most frequently this occurs at the beginning and at the end of the play. *A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Comedy of Errors,* and *Measure for Measure* are all obvious examples. Duke Solinus and Duke Theseus both appear briefly in the first scene in order

to decree the carrying out of the inflexible laws of their states within a certain period; at the end, they reappear to enforce the law's penalty on the unfortunate victims, Aegeon and Hermia respectively, but find a change in the situation which allows them to set the law aside.[2] The Duke in *Measure for Measure* maintains the law in another way: by deputing his office to Angelo in order to end his own too lenient government. He then assumes the disguise of a Friar until the end of the play, when he returns in his own person to establish justice. *Measure for Measure* is indeed a particularly apt illustration of the way in which the individualized Duke still serves the function of the type Duke. When he appears in his own person at the beginning and end of the play, he is carrying out the functions of the type Duke. When he is in the disguise of a Friar, as he is through much of the play, he becomes a definitely individualized character.

The establishment of justice is a second and closely associated function which the type Duke performs. Examples of it are numerous. In *Measure for Measure,* to take a single instance, Angelo has punished Claudio (so Angelo thinks) for the very crime he himself is desiring to commit. Therefore, in accordance with the demands of justice the Duke returns to his own character to mete out retribution on Angelo, "measure for measure."

At this point in the play, a third plot function is performed by the Duke. Mariana pleads for Angelo's life and, after Isabella has also knelt and asked for mercy, the Duke grants it. This, naturally, takes place at the close of the comedy where, once justice has been done to the virtuous party, the spirit of the conventional happy ending calls for acts of forgiveness and accompanying repentance. In *Measure for Measure,* of course, the justice of the grant of mercy and the sincerity of the repentance of the offender have been the subject of much critical controversy. Regardless of the merits of this question, the play is an excellent example of the Duke's fulfilling a traditional rôle.

In *Two Gentlemen of Verona* the Duke does not play the

disinterested part that he plays elsewhere. However, when he does perceive Valentine's true worth, he pardons not only him but also the whole band of outlaws whom Valentine has been leading during his stay in the forest. This final act of justice on the Duke's part and the liberality of his forgiveness reinstate him in the audience's sympathy. When he is the stern father, forcing his daughter to marry a man of rank, he is seen in an extremely unfavorable light. When, as at the end of the play, he is largely the type Duke in the position of head of the state, he redeems himself and is given the respect fittting to his position.

The use of the Duke to maintain the laws and establish justice brings up the question of the degree of authority he possesses. Is he above the law? An investigation of this question discloses the following results. In five plays out of the ten containing Dukes, there is reference to the state's possessing laws which are, apparently, outside the Duke's sole jurisdiction. In one of these plays, *Measure for Measure,* the Duke apparently can modify the law at will; in the other four, *The Comedy of Errors, A Midsummer Night's Dream, Othello,* and *The Merchant of Venice,* he seems to be definitely subservient to the law of the state. In *The Merchant of Venice,* of course, the conflict between justice (as dictated by the laws of the state) and mercy (as established by the Christian tradition) is a large part of the main plot. Shylock defies the Duke to disregard the law. "If you deny me, fie upon your law!" And the Duke is indeed ready to "dismiss the court" when Portia arrives upon the scene. The question whether the Duke, entirely in sympathy with Antonio, will set himself above the law is an intense one until she takes command of the situation, assures Shylock and all concerned that the law must be obeyed, and then turns this weapon of strict legality upon Shylock.[3]

The question whether the Duke is above the law or not seems to be essentially a matter of dramatic expediency. This view is supported by noting the way in which the Dukes disregard the strict letter of the law in *The Comedy of Errors* and A *midsummer Night's Dream.* In spite of the fact that each of the Dukes has stated that he must ob-

serve the law, it is set aside in both the pardon of Aegeon and the acceptance of the new state of affairs in the romantic complications of *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* No one protests at this trivial deviation from technical consistency. The laws of Shakspere's comedy world need be strictly enforced only so long as the dramatist desires a barrier in the way of heroes and heroines.

Because of his position as head of the state, the Duke is a character of great dignity. This is especially true of the type Duke who is usually functioning in his official capacity. It is less true of the individualized Duke. This is shown by the esteem in which the other characters hold the type Duke: he is always addressed as "your Grace", "most gracious lord", "noble Duke", etc.; he is never addressed with the familiar *thee,*[4] he is almost always accompanied by an escort; and he usually ends at least the formal part of the play.

This dignity also comes out in the politness and lack of strong emotion on the part of the Duke. In several instances mention is made of the fighting ability of the Duke but this is always in reference to his past, enhancing his reputation and yet leaving an impression of gravity. The impression is often given of much learning and wisdom, as Prospero so strongly exemplifies. In short, the Duke usually leaves the impression of a sort of elderly Renaissance gentleman.

That this dignity, again, is merely owing to the requirements of the plot is shown in the breaking down of the formal barrier between the Duke and the other characters at the end of the comedies. The Duke suggests festivities, as in *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* where Duke Theseus speaks of a coming fortnight of "nightly revels and new jollity" after a fifth act in which he has been a genial commentator on the "tedious brief scene of young Pyramus and his love Thisby." There is even a suggestion of the Duke's playing host at the end of Act Four of *The Merchant of Venice,* where one would least expect it. The Duke invites Portia to dinner, but she declines for obvious reasons. In

both these cases, as in others like them, the Dukes become extraordinarily informal in comparison with their previous behaviour. This is, of course, necessary in order to leave the audience with a feeling of cordiality and joviality, which is the predominant tone at the end of the play. Often, as in *As You Like It,* an opportunity is provided to clear the stage by the Duke's proposal of a celebration of some sort. This, in turn, allows the Duke to suggest that any minor confusions which are still unresolved will be cleared up in the gossipping, at the feast, over the wondrous events which have just taken place. A feeling of completeness is thus given to the action without boring the audience with details and losing the merry mood of the play's close.

The fact that the Duke is engaged in a rôle dominated by plot considerations and without character interest is brought out by the following table of figures as to the number of scenes in which he appears.

The Comedy of Errors	2 scenes, including first and last
Two Gentlemen of Verona	5 scenes, including * and last
Midsummer Night's Dream	3 scenes, including first and last
The Merchant of Venice	1 scene *
Romeo and Juliet	3 scenes, including first and last
As You Like It	3 scenes, including * and last
Twelfth Night	4 scenes, including first and last
Measure for Measure	** including first and last
Othello	1 scene * *
The Tempest	* last

After what I have said about the Duke's function, it is not surprising to find that he is present in so few scenes, and that such a large proportion of them are at the beginning and end of the play. It is surprising, on the other hand, that the scenes in which the individualized Dukes are not serving the rôle of type character are few. The Duke in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* appears only in four individualized scenes; Duke Senior is present in only two scenes other than that in which he chiefly fulfils the rôle of type Duke; Duke Orsino is on in only two scenes other than the

*Indicates that the Duke appears in what is the beginning or end of a plot though not at the beginning or end of the play itself.

**Indicates that the number of scenes is too great to have significance. In *Measure for Measure,* however, the Duke appears undisguised in only three scenes, two of which are the first and the last.

first and the last—although in these he is mainly an individualized Duke. In only two plays, *Measure for Measure* and *The Tempest,* are the Dukes present in more than a small proportion of the total number of scenes.

Another numerical proportion of some significance is that between the length of time the Dukes are on the stage and the length of time they are speaking. Often, as in the beginning of *The Comedy of Errors,* the Duke does most of the listening and the other characters most of the speaking. In the court scene in *The Merchant of Venice,* after Portia has arrived, more than two hundred lines are spoken while the Duke remains silent. Even a very individualized Duke, Orsino in *Twelfth Night,* has little to say at the end of the play.

The reason for the infrequency of the Duke's presence and the sparsity of the lines he speaks is obvious. He is not an interesting character dramatically, as is shown by his dignity and lack of emotion. Perhaps of more importance is the fact that the Duke's presence in any scenes imposes a restraint on other characters. In view of his rank, respect must be shown him while he is on the stage, and this precludes the development of the action or the presentation of low or high comedy. Only when the Duke is serving such a rôle as that of the match-making parent, as in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* or *The Tempest,* can he be brought frequently into scenes where the plot is being developed. And the fact that only once does the Duke appear in low comedy scenes, and then in disguise, shows what a damper his presence is on scenes of low comedy. This single instance is the insulting of the Duke of Lucio in *Measure for Measure.* Shakspere makes the most of his possibilities for comedy in having Lucio unwittingly calumniate the Duke's character and reputation to his face.

The fact that the Duke is present in the first and last scenes gives him two functions which are largely accidental. When he appears in the opening scene he naturally gives some of the needed exposition, though he is there primarily for other reasons. Again, the fact that the Duke takes part in the final scene and, as the person of highest rank, speaks the conclud-

ing lines, means that he often serves the purpose of summing up the action, as at the end of *Romeo and Juliet*.[5]

A comparison of the Dukes in the plays with their prototypes in the 'sources' is significant. Of the nine plays discussed, three had a definite prototype for Shakspere's ruling figure, a prototype with the same title in both the play and its source. Hence, two of these, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Twelfth Night,* are of little importance in ascertaining Shakspere's handling of the Duke. However, the construction of the plot of the third play, *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* is Shakspere's, and therefore the fact that its Duke, Theseus, performs many of the functions of the type Duke is significant.

Six of the nine plays have no Duke in the source. Two of these, *As You Like It* and *Measure for Measure,* have a king in the source who corresponds to Shakspere's Duke; but Shakspere's conception of these two somewhat individualized characters and his locating of them in the plot are largely his own. The Duke in *As You Like It* has little chance to play the rôle of the type Duke inasmuch as he is in exile throughout the play. The Duke in *Measure for Measure* is closer to the source in regard to his functions as a type character; but his presence in the opening scene is original with Shakspere.

The four remaining plays have no prototypes whatsoever for the Duke. *The Comedy of Errors* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* are two of this group, and they are significantly two of Shakspere's earliest plays, suggesting that this type Duke was used by him from the beginning of his career as a dramatist—when it was suitable to the material of the sources with which he was working. *The Comedy of Errors* contains perhaps the most perfect example of the use of the Duke purely for his type functions. Although *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* has no known source for the part of its Duke, his originality with Shakspere must be minimized, as his character is chiefly individualized.

The Dukes in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello* are almost definitely original with Shakspere because the sug-

gestions for their creation exist in only a few lines of their respective sources. They are both type Dukes in their brief appearance in the plays.

There are, then, four plays whose Duke performs almost exclusively typical functions and is at the same time practically original with Shakspere—*A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Comedy of Errors, The Merchant of Venice,* and *Othello*. There are two plays in which the Duke's rôle as a type character largely follows the source—*Measure for Measure* and *Romeo and Juliet*. There are two plays in which the Duke has only a limited type part—*As You Like It* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. In *As You Like It* the Duke's part in the main follows the source; in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* it is probably original. Finally, in *Twelfth Night* the Duke's rôle is largely indebted to the source and is also only to a small degree that of a type Duke.

Cambridge, Mass.

[1]Duke Orsino in *Twelfth Night* and more especially Prospero in *The Tempest* are too individualized to perform many functions similar to those of the type Duke. But even here there are points of comparison—such as the way in which Prospero and Orsino conclude the plays. The villainous Dukes in *As You Like It* and *The Tempest* are left out of the discussion for obvious reasons.

[2]The end of the main plot of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* occurs at the end of Act Four. So likewise does the Antonio-Shylock plot of *The Merchant of Venice*. The plots of *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *As You Like It,* on the other hand, begin in a sense with the Second Act, in which the respective Dukes first appear; in both cases the locale of the play is established at this point.

[3]Mention should be made of the peculiar position of the two Dukes of Venice in *Othello* and *The Merchant of Venice*. In both plays there is a recognition of a political power other than that of the Duke: the Senators in *Othello* and the Magnificoes in *The Merchant of Venice*. Brabantio is referred to as one "whose voice is double as the Duke's", a clear suggestion of this division of political power.

[4]Proteus uses *thee* to the Duke in *Two Gentlemen of Verona;* but at that moment he is in a personal relation to the Duke, whom he is advising in family affairs.

[5]Of course, the ruling figure in *Romeo and Juliet* is a Prince. He is included in this paper, however, because he is a type Duke in all but name.

A CONTEMPORARY ATTACK UPON SHAKSPERE?

By ALFRED HARBAGE

THE Tragical History, Admirable Achievements, and various events of Guy Earl of Warwick, A Tragedy Acted very Frequently with great Applause, By his late Majesties Servants. Written by B. J. Thus reads a title page of 1661. The "B. J." probably means only that the publishers, Thomas Vere and William Gilbertson, having a play to vend, wished to suggest the name which in 1661 and for a few years thereafter stood highest on the roster of English playwrights. The only connection between this play and the Restoration period may be the misleading title-page: some copies, although none I have seen, contain a flyleaf marked "Imprimatur. April. 6. 1639."[1] That the tragedy was "Acted very Frequently . . . By his late Majesties Servants" must also have been invented for a title-page refurbishing an old book. It is extremely unlikely that any play of the type of *Guy of Warwick* was ever acted by the modish King's Company in the time of Charles or even in the time of James.

In his *Dictionary of Old English Plays,* Halliwell-Phillipps suggested that the play might be identical with *The Life and Death of Guy of Warwick,* entered in the Stationers' Register January 15, 1620, as by Day and Dekker —to which A. H. Bullen rejoined " . . . I doubt whether either of the authors, if they had tried, could have written so execrably."[2] Bullen's remark seems to have killed further interest in the play among historians of the drama. The piece, however, is not contemptible. The curious impression it makes is due to the fact that *Guy of Warwick* is completely archaic for 1661, for 1639, or even for 1620. Either it was already old in 1620 or its author must be imagined as a sort of seventeenth-century Chatterton. The lines,

> His sacred fury menaceth that Nation,
> Which hath Indea under Sequestration:
> He doth not strike at Surplices and Tippits
> (To bring an Oleo in of Sects in Sippits),

included in Time's speech before the second act, strike the only seventeenth-century note, and even in their style suggest an insertion into earlier work.

The *Guy of Warwick* of 1661 (1639) was written, I believe, in approximately its present form about the year 1593. There is no record of a Guy of Warwick play at that time, but we can postulate the existence of one. Henslowe records performances of a *Huon of Bordeaux* in 1593 and of a *Godfrey of Boulogne, Part II,* in 1594.[3] It is incredible that the English worthy was banished while these foreign knights, with whom his name was often associated, were striding the boards: patriotism would forbid! Of the three literary sources of our play, the latest in print[4] was *A plesante songe of the valiant actes of Guy of Warwick,* a ballad published in 1592. The fact is noteworthy because the Guy of Warwick legend gathered accretions as time passed, and the play shows no effect of the accretions after 1592. For instance, it is next to certain that any play on the subject written after 1608 would have made use of Samuel Rowlands' narrative poem *The Famous History of Guy Earl of Warwicke,* which succeeded to the popularity once enjoyed by the metrical romance.

The best indication of an early date is the text of the play itself. It is constructed like the older chronicles, with each act presenting a new exploit of the English hero and new drolleries by the hero's clownish servant. The following passage from Act V indicates the general quaintness:

Phillis. Give me some Bread? I prethee Father Eat.
Guy. Give me Brown Bread, for thats a Pilgrimes Meat.
Phillis. Reach me some Wine, good Father tast of this.
Guy. Give me cold Water that my Comfort is, . . .

In its kind the handling of the material is effective, and the venerable Guy's conquest of the Danish champion in the fourth act would have quickened the pulse of any London audience in the sixteenth century, and of any country audience long thereafter. Throughout the play, Time acts as Chorus and Presenter, narrating those deeds of Sir Guy not represented in action, in a manner reminding us of Marlowe's *Faustus* and other plays of its vintage:

> Renowned Sir Guy of Warwick whose great Name,
> makes England famous in all after times,
> for nursing up so brave a Martiallist,
> Time now renues his fortunes to the world
> and layes them open to your Gentle Views;
> think then with apprehensive eyes you see
> this warlike Lord boldly attempt to fight,
> with that fell savage Bore of Calledon
> that spoiles the fields and murders passengers,
> him hath his sword subdu'd; . . . . .
> . . . . . Imagine then,
> King Athelstone hath left fair Winchester
> and here in Warwick Castle keeps his Court.
> What follows now of Guy and his fair Deeds,
> sit and behold, the story now proceeds.[5]

Compare with Chorus's speech before Act II of Dekker's *Old Fortunatus:*

> Suppose you see him [Fortunatus] brought to Babylon;
> And that the sun clothed all in fire hath rid
> One quarter of his hot celestial way
> With the bright morning, and that in this instant,
> He and the Soldan meet, but what they say
> Listen you—the talk of kings none dare bewray.

Even by 1599 Dekker felt somewhat apologetic about employing the Chorus in this old-fashioned way: in his Prologue the Muse

> . . . begs your pardon, for she'll send me forth
> Not when the laws of poesy do call
> But as the story needs . . .

I quote the passages only as an indication of an early date of the play, not as evidence of Dekker's authorship. Dekker as author, however, cannot be summarily dismissed.

H. Dugdale Sykes, who has listed parallel passages as proof of authorship more convincingly than anyone else, has noted Dekker's fondness for iteration.[6] Observe in the present play "O Master! the Devil, the Devil, the Devil" (Act II); "Tarry, tarry, tarry, hold, hold, hold" (Act III); "O my belly, my belly, my belly" (Act V). Sykes has noted that " 'Hellhound' is one of his most frequently used, and most distinctive, terms of abuse."[7] Observe in the present play "Hell-hound come forth, that I may cope with thee" (Act II). Just as Fortune awakens Fortunatus with music

in Dekker's *Old Fortunatus,* so Oberon, as benign spirit, awakens Sir Guy in the present piece:

> Nymphes, Satyres, Fawnes, and all the Fairy train,
> that waits on Oberon the Fairy King,
> attend me quickly with your silver tunes;
> and in a circled Ring, lets compasse round,
> this sleeping Knight that lies upon the ground.
> (Enter the Fairies with Musick . . .)
> *Guy.* Where art thou Guy? what heavenly place is this?
> what ravishing sound of Music fills mine ear?"[8]

For Thomas Dekker music was ever *ravishing.* The phrase "silver tunes" is interesting in view of the following, from Dekker:

> Music talk louder, that thy silver voice
> May reach my sovereign's ears.
> *Satiromastix,* II. 1.
>
> I tried and found it true: and secretely
> Commanded music with her silver tongue
> To chime soft lullabies . . .
> *Old Fortunatus,* III, 2.

I offer one more parallel, by far the most striking: Dekker's

> Canst drink the waters of the crispëd spring?
> O sweet content.[9]

perfects a distich in *Guy of Warwick,* Act V:

> . . . . . your great Lord and I,
> have thought our selves as happy as a King,
> To drink the water of a Christal spring.

That such evidence amounts to proof I do not pretend, nor that *Guy of Warwick* is *worthy* of the playwright whom we have come to admire. It is too naïve, the blank verse often too mechanical or languid. But we must remember that Dekker's early work is lost, and we do not know how he may have been writing in 1593. This[10] may be his first play, written just as he reached his majority. The author is mentioned in Time's concluding speech—worth quoting also for several fine slow lines, and for the benedictory note typical only of pre-seventeenth-century plays:

> Thus Time concludes this dolent History,
> And ends this Scene with Guy of Warwick's death;
> So what is it but Time can bring to passe?

> Time layes up Treasure where ther's Vertue scant,
> And gives the silly Fool when wise Men want:
> Both Poor and Rich confesse my power Divine,
> And every one doth say, make much of Time,
> Through the whole World, while the world was, Time rangeth,
> And 'tis mens manners, and not Time that changeth.
> Of you whose Souls look for Eternity,
> Rest in the peace of perpetuity,
> And kindly grant to this request of mine;
> For he's but young that writes of this Old Time.
> Therefore if this your Eyes or Ears may please,
> He means to shew you better things than these.

I shall request for a moment a "suspension of disbelief" while I fill in, with suppositions, the contours connecting the peaks of fact that rise out of the mist. About 1593 young Dekker, destined later to do "better things," wrote *Guy of Warwick,* which, after a brief career in London, went on the road as part of the repertory of II Derby's Men in 1594. During the long provincial career[11] of this company, the play remained a stock piece. On October 14, 1618, John Taylor, the water poet, was stopping at the Maidenhead Inn, Islington, where "we had a play of the Life and Death of Guy of Warwick, played by the Right Honourable the Earl of Derby his men."[12] In the meantime, Dekker had become an old hand as a dramatist in London, and was writing new plays on some of the themes he had treated in his youth. In 1620 he collaborated with Massinger on *The Virgin Martyr,* a new version of *Dioclesian,* which he had written originally in 1594.[13] A short time earlier he had collaborated with John Day on a new version of *Guy of Warwick.* On January 20, 1620, the play was entered in the Stationers' Register by John Trundle, who on December 13 of the same year assigned his rights to Thomas Langley.[14] Unfortunately, however, the play was never printed, and the title in the Stationers' Register was naturally identified in later ages as the play seen by Taylor at Islington. But the old play went on its independent way. In 1633 it was still being acted before country audiences by a group of tattered strollers, and Dobson had seen it before Thomas Nabbes brought him to London to be a character in *Covent Garden:*

> *Ralph.* . . . we shall then be neere the Cockpit, and
> see a play now and then.

Dobs. But tell me Ralph, are those players the ragged fellows that were at our house last Christmas, that borrowed the red blanket off my bed to make their Major a gowne; and had the great Pot-lid for Guy of Warwicks Buckler?

Ralph. No, Dobson, they are men of Credit.[15]

Finally, the old text, somewhat debased by years of copying by actors none too careful of their grammar, found its way into print, and survived, with a title page faked in 1661, as an enigma for posterity. The light is imperfect, and the things one sees may not be precisely what occurred.

And now I should like to dismiss all theories except that *Guy of Warwick* is old—as old as 1593. This I firmly believe to be true. If the play of 1661 had been published in 1593, and later submitted to the scrutiny which all plays of that time have received, how would the following passage from Act V have been interpreted?

Rainborne. . . . prethee where wer't born?

Sparrow. Ifaith Sir I was born in England at Stratford upon Aven in Warwickshire.

Rainborne. Wer't born in England? What's thy name?

Sparrow. Nay I have a fine finical name, I can tell ye, for my name is Sparrow; yet I am no house Sparrow, nor no hedge Sparrow, nor no peaking Sparrow, nor no sneaking Sparrow, but I am a high mounting lofty minded Sparrow, and that Parnell knows well enough, and a good many more of the pretty Wenches of our Parish ifaith.

Sir Guy came from Warwickshire and might naturally be squired by someone from his native county, but why should the town be specified? and why should that town be Stratford-upon-Avon? And why should this clown, this "bird of Venus, and a Cock of the game,"[16] this sneak thief of the "Pogans snap-sacks,"[17] describe himself at this moment as *a high mounting lofty minded Sparrow?* Then that *fine finical name.* Sparrow is not a fine finical name, but come to think of it, *Shakspere* is—an offense in itself to rival poets so plainly dubbed as Robert Green or Tom Dekker.

Sparrow is never referred to as a poet. If he were, we would be confronted by a minor miracle, because the allusion to Shakspere would be undebatable. Sparrow, in most

ways the conventional clown, is wholly base and contemptible. It is unpleasant to consider him a lampoon upon Shakspere, and even more unpleasant to think of our genial Thomas Dekker as author of the lampoon. I shall merely repeat that if *Guy of Warwick* had been published in 1593, Sparow would long since have been identified as the dramatist, and embattled commentators would contest the issue of whether Sir Guy adumbrated Southampton. Truly, Shakspere's early career in London may well have provoked more than the one known public slur by Greene. Some rival company may have attacked him on the stage. Success in its beginnings rarely goes uncastigated. Shakspere was an intruder upon Parnassus, irritatingly superior: we do not know what spurns his patient merit took of the unworthy, of the resentful, of the young and foolish.

University of Pennsylvania.

---

[1]R. S. Crane, "The Vogue of Guy of Warwick," PMLA, XXX (1915). 162n.

[2]*Works of John Day,* 1881, p. 11.

[3]*Henslowe's Diary,* ed. W. W. Greg, Part 1, 1904, pp. 16, 18. The "2 pte of godfrey of bullen" is specified as new.

[4]The others are the Huon of Bordeaux legend, from which one episode was borrowed, and the old metrical romance of Guy of Warwick, which had been in print in a number of editions since the late fifteenth century. Many details in the play could have come only from the metrical romance. See R. S. Crane, *op. cit.,* pp. 164-165.

[5]Time's speech before Act. I.

[6]*Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama,* p. 106.

[7]*Ibid,* p. 106.

[8]Act II.

[9]I believe that Dekker's claim to this lyric is still good.

[10]Various passages in *Guy of Warwick* remind me of Dekker's cast of thought:

> those that have learned of Angells how to sing,
> and to the world all piety doth bring,
> and fills the world with learning and with Art,
> to those doth Time her Golden gifts impart;
> Time's Induction to Act III.

> The longest Summers day comes to an end,
> the dials point though none perceive it stur. (Act V.)

> long stories are not told in little time,
> much matter in small room we must combyne;
> wee'l curtall nothing, yet make something short,
> because we would shun tediousnesse of sport;
> if it be long, say length is all the fault,
> if it be lame, say old men needs must halt.
> Time's Induction to Act III.

The unexpected whimsicality of the concluding line above is typical of Dekker: compare with the concluding line of Chorus's speech from *Old Fortunatas,* quoted above, with which speech compare also the following:

> Now that the poasting Charet of the Sonne,
> hath tired Phoebus and his wanton steeds,
> the duskey Clouds hath closed up the day,
> and Hesperus is left to guide the world.
>
> Act V. (*Guy of Warwick*).

[11]J. T. Murray, *English Dramatic Companies, 1558-1642,* 1910, II, 295-296.

[12]John Taylor, *Penniless Pilgrimage,* 1618, ed. C. Hindley, *Old Book Collector's Miscellany,* Vol. II, No. 10, p. 67.

[13]That *The Virgin Martyr* is a rewriting of the lost *Diocletian,* and that the latter was by Dekker, was proposed by Fleay, and the proposal has met with considerable favor. (See W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary,* II, 172). Similar claims, concerning rewriting, have been made for a number of plays, Dekker's and those of other dramatists, and while the evidence in individual instances must be inconclusive, the general proposition, that certain "lost" plays of the 'nineties survive in later adaptations, must be accepted as probable.

[14]Here the record in the Stationers' Register ceases. I wish to pose a problem for scientific bibliographers. Who, on the basis of typographical evidence, was the original publisher of the play bearing Vere and Gilbertson's title page in 1661? If it was Langley, Dekker's claim to the play is established, but my general theory about *Guy of Warwick* receives a blow.

[15]Thomas Nabbes, *Covent Garden,* I, 1.

[16]He so describes himself in Act II, telling Sir Guy "My mistress Parnell is as precious to me, as your Lady Phillis is to you." (He has got Parnell with child before leaving Stratford-on-Avon.) Parnell was the stock name for a loose woman, Sparrow probably for a lecher; hence "bird of Venus." Still, *Venus and Adonis* was published in 1593.

[17]Act III.

AN EARLY *HAMLET* ALLUSION

By HOWARD SCHULTZ

THE next revisers of the *Shakespeare Allusion-Book* may wish to include, for the year 1633, an all but anonymous quotation of *Hamlet,* I, v, 53-57. The lines are printed as prose and without credit in supplementary matter padding out the third edition of the *Philosophers' Banquet,* an expansion of that popular household manual of health hints, venerable satire, and jests, attributed by some to Theobaldus Anguilbertus, but by most to the thirteenth-century "wizard," Michael Scott.[1] Of the second English translation, which title-pages credit to an otherwise unknown "W. B. Esquire," there were progressively enlarged editions in 1609, 1614, and 1633; but only the last of these offers a final 130 pages, unknown to the Latin texts, captioned "A Divine and Philosophicall conference betweene some Fathers of the Church, and some Philosophers of Nature, proposing . . . Pious . . . Aenigmaes."[2] To the question, "May it be that stollen pleasures should be thought more sweet than an honest fruition in lawfull marriage?" the author of this "table conference," whom for lack of better information we may identify with "W. B.," gives the following answer:

> We desire forbidden things, and that is the perversenesse of our flesh, that will not be brideled with no lawfull bounds, and wee see by experience that many men that have beautiful wives neglect their own better, and pray upon others more deformed. For Vertue as it never will bee mou'd, though lewdness court it in the shape of heaven; So Lust, though to a radiant Angell linckt, will sort it selfe in a terrestrial bed, and prey on garbige.[3]

The misquotation of the First Folio text is worth a moment's consideration. As printed in 1623 the familiar lines of the Ghost's speech run:

> Though Lewdnesse court it in a shape of Heauen:
> So Lust, though to a radiant Angell link'd,
> Will sate it selfe in a Celestiall bed, & prey on Garbage.

Taken by itself, the last line looks like a correction of an obvious misprint in the "surreptitious" First Quarto of 1603:

> Would fate it selfe from a celestiall bedde,
> And prey on garbage.

The "good" quartos of 1604 and 1611 are closer to the prose of "W. B.":

> Will sort it selfe in a celestiall bed
> And pray on garbage.

It was the opinion of Tschischwitz, quoted by H. H. Furness,[4] that *sort* of the good quartos is perfectly allowable:

> The reading of the Qq makes excellent sense, even without changing 'in' to *from*. 'Even in a celestial bed lust will separate, detach itself, etc.' Not only 'link'd," but also 'prey,' shows *sort* to be the emphatic word. It is small wonder if German commentators prefer 'sate' to *sort,* but Englishmen, before whose vision the enormous breadth of their own almost square beds must have instantly arisen, ought to have conceived the right idea of *separation in bed.* Moreover, 'sate itself' cannot be connected with 'prey on garbage' on physiological grounds.

Whether the language of "W. B." is an arbitrary correction of a quarto print or a stage recollection with a shadow of textual authority in its own right, it confirms Tschischwitz's definition of *sort.* Yet even with this definition the German editor's ingenious interpretation makes but strained sense out of the quarto reading; the notion of separation in bed seems somehow far-fetched and trivial. If Shakspere wrote "sort . . . celestial," as he probably did not, he left an improvable line. The Folio reading, "sate . . . celestial," is a feasible alteration; the "W. B." version, "sort . . . terrestrial," is another.

Northwestern University
Evanston, Ill.

---

[1]An informal description of the work is to be found in "The Philosophy of the Table under Charles I," *Retrospective Review* II (1854), 142-150. Thomas F. Dunn, "The Facetiæ of the *Mensa Philosophorum*," *Washington University Studies in Language and Literature,* N. S., No. 5 (June, 1934), pp. 9-13, gives a convenient bibliography of the manuscripts and prints.

[2]This caudal display of theological and moral banalities contains another echo of Shakspere, listed in George Thorn-Drury's collection, *Some Seventeenth Century Allusions to Shakespeare and His Works* (London, 1920), p. 1. The lines quoted are nearly identical with *Richard II,* III, iii, 169-170.

[3]Pp. 326-327.

[4]Ed. *Hamlet,* in *The Variorum Shakespeare,* I (1877), 101 n.

SPENSER'S FABLE OF "THE OAKE AND THE BRERE"

By LOUIS S. FRIEDLAND

IN an interesting paper (*SAB,* XV, 103-109), Mr. Sidney Rosenzweig advances the following suggestions regarding the fable in Spenser's February Eclogue: (1) that the fable is closely related to and actually developed from a passage in Ascham's *Scholemaster;* (2) that a contemporary allusion to the downfall or ill-treatment of some Roman-Catholic notable—whom Mr. Rosenzweig is unable to identify—is shrouded in the well-known lines:

> "For it had bene an auncient tree,
> Sacred with many a mysteree,
> And often crost with the priestes crewe,
> And often halowed with holy water dewe.
> But sike fancies weren foolerie,
> And broughten this Oake to this miserye." (207-12)

The evidence adduced by Mr. Rosenzweig to support his views will bear examination.

Beyond a doubt, Spenser (and E. K., very likely) were acquainted with Ascham's book; therefore, it may be assumed, with the passage therein upon which Mr. Rosenzweig bases his first contention. To demonstrate the kinship between Spenser's fable and Ascham's sustained metaphor: Cambridge scholarship as "mightie great timber" or trees shot up from "the yong spring," Mr. Rosenzweig resorts to the method of citing parallel passages in which verbal identities are conveniently italicized for the reader. I had thought that this mode of 'proving' literary origins had long ago been renounced by scholars for the very reasons that make Mr. Rosenzweig's parallelisms far-fetched, fanciful, and inconclusive. The listing of similarities of phrasing and diction may serve to clinch an argument already pretty well established on other and firmer grounds: external evidence of relationship, the barring of other possible sources after judicious examination of their claims, close resemblances in literary form and intention, and so on.

True, Mr. Rosenzweig opens his discussion with a reference to another possible source of Spenser's fable: the homily preached by Bishop John Young of Rochester, to which Dr. Percy W. Long first called attention some years ago.[1] The merits of this case Mr. Rosenzweig dismisses with the words: "This proposed source reveals no verbal parallel to the Eclogue beyond the mention of the briar." And yet, despite the absence of any verbal similarities between the passage in the sermon and Spenser's fable, the former may well have prompted the poet's thoughts, though in his paper Dr. Long wisely cautions us against arriving at a conviction of positive relationship between the two. The "germ" of Spenser's fable still remains Aesop's apologue of the Tree and the Briar, which Spenser, like other schoolboys of his youth, had learned by heart as a set task, and with several recensions of which he was assuredly familiar.

How, then, are we to regard the passage in Ascham's book —or that in Bishop Young's homily? Simply as an outgrowth from the same 'germ': the Aesopic fable of a Tree and a Reed, Briar, or Rosebush. Merely as applications of Aesop's idea, among many hundreds of similar ones, antedating Spenser's fable, found in pulpit-oratory, emblem-writings, letters,—in every variety of prose and poetic literature. In fact, the metaphoric use of the Aesopic apologue had become pretty well standardized, so that scores of passages of a purport similar to Ascham's passage might be gathered in contemporary literature, if the effort were worth it. Some of them are alluded to in my study of Spenser's fables.[2] A stock metaphor, it occurs everywhere; nothing was more common for figurative purposes than the convenient, homely, and familiar 'lesson' of the Oak and the Briar. Witness, among others, the lines in Spenser's *Ruines of Time* (450-455) and in the *Teares of the Muses* (75-78),—identical with Ascham's use of the well-worn, constantly iterated figure: the ancient trees of learning compared with the younger blooms. Parallels? They are a dime a dozen, so plentiful as to be dear at any price.

It is difficult to believe in 'imitation' when we are concerned with a device of expression so prevalent and wide-

spread in Elizabethan literature. But verbal echoes, it may be argued, are not to be lightly dismissed. I could wish that Mr. Rosenzweig had a better, more convincing array of verbal similarities; those he offers are too fanciful to carry weight with the scholar skeptical of this type of evidence. The establishing of the fact of Spenser's indebtedness to Ascham is in itself an attractive idea and worthy of pursuit. I must regretfully confess my opinion that the matter is not substantiated in the paper under discussion. The pitfalls of wire-drawn verbal 'analogies' are illustrated in the following passage from Mr. Rosenzweig's article (p. 107): "There may be another echo of Ascham in the pastoral scene that takes place about the Briar:

> 'And thereto aye wonned to repayre
> The shepheards daughters, to gather flowres. (ll. 118-19).'

"E. K.'s gloss on 'wonned' reads 'to *haunt* or frequent'; Ascham's typically Elizabethen harangue against the Catholics carries the same tone of moral self-righteousness: 'honest pastimes joyned with labor left of in the fieldes: unthrifty and idle games *haunted* corners and occupied the nightes. (p. 165).'" It will be seen that, when Spenser's verses fail the critic, he turns to E. K.'s glosses.

Unfortunately, E. K.'s gloss on the word 'wonned' happens to be the very one that casts the gravest doubts upon the theory that E. K. was really Spenser in disguise. Who, in the year 1578, knew so well as Chaucerian Spenser that 'wonned' here means 'were wont, were accustomed,' and not 'to haunt or frequent'? Never would Spenser have furnished or authorized this erroneous and misleading gloss. And while it seems likely that E. K. derived much of his information direct from Spenser, it is equally obvious that the poet was neither questioned about the word 'wonned' nor had oversight of this as of several others of E. K.'s annotations. On occasion E. K. was led astray by Spenser's archaic diction, which in this instance has also tripped a modern commentator.

The trouble, however, does not lie so much in the commission of errors as in the method employed: straining for verbal parallels as a means of tracing and uncovering

'sources'. A sustained plant-metaphor like the one developed by Ascham in the *Scholemaster* may profitably be compared with others of the same variety, *e.g.,* the lines in the *Ruines of Time* and in the *Teares of the Muses* already mentioned. To institute collations between these and any fable of the Oak and the Briar is to compare things quite unlike. The effective and illuminating approach to the study of the Elizabethan fable is to view it as an art-form, a minor literary genre whose rules were fixed, rigidly set in the rhetoric books of the day. A succession of rhetoricians (Leonard Cox, Thomas Wilson, Richard Rainolde, and others), studied by generations of schoolboys and university men, had examined the art of fable-writing and had established its divisions and laws and modes of amplification as precisely as the American rhetoricians of my college-days prescribed every step in the planning and writing of an argumentative brief and the developed argument. As is true of the other minor literary types—and the major ones, to a different degree—the Renaissance conceived of the fable as, first of all, a school-task in rhetoric; its structure: opening, gradations, amplifications, ornaments, closing, were definitely blue-printed for the unpracticed hand. No professor of pulpit-oratory in modern times has been more insistent on the routine of divisions, parts, and adherence to the rhetorical rules of treatment: the text, expatiation on the text, firstly, secondly, thirdly, and so on through the hortatory peroration. The modest structure of the fable had its hard and fixed architectonics.

This aspect of Spenser's fable of the "Oake and the Brere" had been briefly examined by Professor Herbert D. Dix in a review of *Rhetoric in Spenser's Poetry,*[3] with especial reference to Rainolde's *Foundacion of Rhetorike* (1563). As Mr. Dix points out (pp. 9, 80-81), Rainolde held that the 'Oracion' made upon a fable should have eight parts, among them: reciting the fable; praise of the author (Spenser says the author is Tityrus, but E. K. correctly refers to Aesop); stating the nature of the 'thynges conteined in the Fable' (the detailed description of the Oak and the Briar); setting forth 'the thynges, reasonyng one with an other' (the Briar puts his case to the Oak and then to the Husbandman);

the interpretation or explaining the moral ("Such was th'end of this ambitious Brere For scorning Eld").

In his time no one more than Spenser was so constant in adherence to the principle of literary *decorum.* For this reason, as the present writer has repeatedly stated elsewhere, the type-study of Spenser's poems brings the surest results, even in the procedure of examining analogous works and of hunting for possible sources. Spenser's first published work, *The Shepheardes Calender,* is replete with stock rhetorical devices and figures, ranging from the simple ballad simile to the set modes of constructing an eclogue, a panegyric, a flyting, an anacreontic, an elegy, and so on. At every point the *Calender* reveals its indebtedness to the school rhetoric of the time, just as surely as Shakspere's *Love's Labour's Lost* and his early pastoral plays and comedies are chockful of the conventional conceits and devices of poetry in contemporary masque, pastoral, and drama.

This conception of Spenser's fable of 'The Oake and the Brere' enables us to view in its proper light the second of Mr. Rosenzweig's theses: that the lines in the fable describing the ancient tree cloak a reference to some personage, a Catholic, apparently. I have discussed this problem at some length in my study of *Spenser as a Fabulist,* and I see no reason for altering the opinions therein expressed. Spenser's 'oracion' on the fable of the Oak and the Briar is couched in the form of an extended parable, "an icon or hypotiposis", to use E. K.'s terms, of Youth versus Age. For this turn of the 'oracion' Spenser had no model known to us, so that it must be regarded as his own invention, a fresh version of the age-old fable. Its declared meaning is determined by Spenser's shaping thought: the bitter enmity of Youth towards Age. The ancient Oak is described as, in former times, a Gospel Oak, an object of worship. All this is a proper part of Spenser's 'oracion,' the rhetorical treatment of his theme, an ornamental bit of characterization and not a hidden allusion to a contemporary religious quarrel. As a pronounced anti-Catholic, E. K. has an especially eager nose for religio-controversial touches in the *Calender;* he never hesitates to point them out, to exaggerate their import, and to

gloat over them. But his gloss on the passage in question gives no indication of his awareness that the lines cloaked a reference to a Catholic personage. It seems to me that there is no warrant for selecting this brief passage as the 'key' to the fable, thus making the interpretation of the Oak and of the entire apologue dependent upon a highly speculative unsupported, and dubious explanation of the five lines.

It remains true, I believe, that Spenser's amplification of the fable of the Oak and the Briar has no known model in English or foreign literature and is a fresh invention; that it is an emblem, an 'icon or hypotiposis' of Youth *contra* Age, not an allegorical presentation of certain contemporary happenings; that the characters in the fable, including the Oak, do not represent historical persons: Queen Elizabeth, Lord Burghley, Bishop Watson, etc., and that the attempts at such 'recognitions' have so far been wholly unconvincing; finally, that the passage depicting the reverence once accorded the ancient Oak is an ornamental bit of rhetorical poetry, in keeping with Spenser's plan of the 'oracion' and is to be interpreted as an allusion to tree-worship and not to some Catholic personage or some religious controversy of the time.

New York City.

---

[1]*PMLA,* XXXI (1916), 727.28.
[2]*SAB,* XII, April, July, October, 1937.
[3]*The Pennsylvania State College Studies,* No. 7, 1940.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

By S. A. T.

WILLIAM BAILEY KEMPLING

We dedicate, in sadness, this issue of our *Bulletin* to the memory of William Bailey Kempling who departed this life on January 31st, 1941, in the home-town of William Shakspere where he had resided for the past three years. In him our Association has lost a good and loyal friend and Shakspere an understanding and loving disciple. For many years he and the present writer had been warm and affectionate correspondence-friends; we had never met but we felt that we knew and trusted each other and could —and did—speak our hearts freely about matters which interested us both.

Mr. Kempling was born in Hull in 1869 and wrote for many English newspapers and periodicals. Almost all his life he was especially interested in Shakspere, a subject on which he wrote many newspaper articles and some essays. With each issue of the *Bulletin* the *Stratford-on-Avon Herald* carried an appreciative notice of our work. To Americans he is probably best known by his little book, *The Shakespeare Memorials of London.* In his last years he was planning a book—*In Shakspere's Name* —in which he would have recorded his impressions of the many Shakspere lovers he had known in the flesh and in spirit. But, alas! that is not to be.

AN EMENDATION IN *KING LEAR*

There is a passage in *King Lear* which, notwithstanding its currency with most modern editors is, when properly considered, utterly unacceptable. Edmund, planning to displant Edgar from their father's favor, says, according to the early Quartos:

> "and [= if] my inuention thriue, *Edmund* the base shall tooth legitimate: I grow, I prosper,".

In the Folio the passage which corresponds to this is printed (as verse) thus:

> "And my inuention thriue, *Edmond* the base
> "Shall to' th' Legitimate: I grow, I prosper:".

The first two eighteenth-century editors seem to have been quite satisfied with the Folio text; but in his second edition (1728) Pope made Edmund say that he would "be th' legitimate," although nothing in the world could make him so. In his vitriolic *Canons of Criticism* Thomas Edwards approved of Capell's suggestion that we read "*top* the legitimate" and most editors since then have so read, mainly because they think that Shakspere wrote "top" as a kind of opposition to "base" in the preceding verse and because Capell saw in "top" a connection with the words "I grow." Some editors, however, had sufficient acquaintance with Shakspere's ways not to be taken in by Capell's logic; they saw that "top th' legitimate" does not fit into Shaksperian verse. A few editors read "*to* th' legitimate" and interpret it—wilfully and indefensibly—as meaning "advance to or take the place of the legitimate" (Nichols). Other suggestions too have been made but they do not deserve to be mentioned here. The German translators, for example, treat the sentence as unfinished or they substitute some word like "stürzen" for the puzzling "to."

Hanmer long ago suggested substituting "toe" (as a verb) for the early "too" and "to" with the meaning "to come up to and be on even ground with [Edgar]," but he could not cite a parallel usage of the word, nor does it seem likely that this is what Edmund intends. Malone adopted "toe" because he had been informed that in Devonshire "to toe a thing up is to tear it up by the roots," even though "to toe" is not "to toe up."

That "toe" is Shakspere's word is absolutely certain. Dr. Johnson (not quoted by Furness!) so understood the passage; his comment was "To *toe* him, is perhaps to *kick* him *out*, . . . or . . . to *supplant* him." True, no dictionary known to me so defines the word prior to Shakspere's use of it in this sense, but we know that Shakspere constantly indulged in new coinages and new usages. To cite examples of this is surely unnecessary when writing for professed Shaksperians, although it may be mentioned as at least a curious coincidence that Shakspere seems to have been the first to use the word "foot" in the sense of "to spurn" (*Merchant of Venice*, I, iii, 119). The spelling "toe" is really only a modernization in orthography, inasmuch as "too" was common and correct spelling for "toe" throughout the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries. (See the *Oxford Dictionary*.) That conservative Shakspere so spelled the word is fairly inferable from the fact that in the 1609 Quartos of *Troilus and Cressida*—another play in all probability printed from his manuscript—we find (in IV, v, 15) the following: "He rises on the too". The word "base" suggests "toe" to Edmund, and the thought of kicking Edgar out so exhilarates him that he exclaims, "I grow! I prosper!"

SHAKSPERE AND JAPAN

As a rule we expect nothing good to come out of Japan nowadays. But there are exceptions to most rules, says another rule. And we are happy to inform our readers that a good (that is, a worthwhile and useful) book on the god of our idolatry has just come out of Japan. It is entitled *Shakespeare in Japan: An Historical Survey* and is the work of a real scholar and lover of the great English poet, Dr. Minoru Toyoda (the latter being his surname), professor of English literature in the Imperial University of Kyushu. The book, consisting of some 150 pages, is nicely printed, in large, clear type, bound in boards (gold lettered), is issued by the Shakespeare Association of Japan, and is appropriately dedicated to the memory of Dr. Tsubouchi, "the first, and so far the only, translator in to Japanese of the complete works of Shakespeare." Unlike so many other English books on Shakspere by foreigners, especially Frenchmen and Germans, this one is well and interestingly written, without any barbarisms and the usual "howlers." It is worthy of special mention that as a result of financial support from the Cultural Work Bureau of the Japanese Foreign Office gift copies of this book will be presented to such "institutions and societies" in various parts of the world as may ask for it.

Dr. Toyoda discusses his subject in eight chapters, the first dealing with "the gradual approach to Shakespeare" in the 19th century, the second with early foreign professors of English literature, the third and fourth with translations, the fifth with stories and Japanese adaptations, the sixth with biographies and critical Japanese histories of English literature, the eighth with Shakspere on the

Japanese stage since his first appearance there (with *The Merchant of Venice!*) in 1885. This is followed (pages 121-139) by what is the most valuable part of the book for us, even though the subject is not treated exhaustively, a bibliography of Japanese Shaksperiana.

We extend our sincerest congratulations to all who had anything to do with the publication of this highly desirable and well-made book.

THE HAMLET - LAERTES BOUT

There are many *Hamlet* problems which will not down. One of the most obstreperous of these is the fencing bout between Laertes and the hero in the last act of the play. The most recent assay to explain the terms and technique of the bout is that of Mr. Horace S. Craig who discusses "Dueling Scenes and Terms in Shakespeare's Plays" in the ninth volume (pages 1 to 28) of the *University of California Publications in English.* Withe great cock-sureness the author discourses on the theory and practice of the duel in the Elizabethan period, Shakspere's technical knowledge of dueling, and the various references to dueling in Shakspere's plays. The essay ends with a very useful "vocabulary of Elizabethan dueling and fencing terms."

Undoubtedly the author has read much and thought much on the subject and his work deserves careful consideration, even though in our estimation he has not solved the *Hamlet* problem and has seriously impaired the value of his work by having failed to read Miss Guttman's essay on "The Fencing Bout in Hamlet" which was published in the April 1939 issue of this *Bulletin.*

Mr. Craig's explanation of the exchange of "weapons" is expressed in the following words (pp. 21-22): "Is it imagining too much to see Laertes, desperate in his failure to pink Hamlet in the course of a "phrase d'armes," leap at his foe who is standing, foil point on the floor, unprepared, while Osric is saying, "Nothing neither way!" Laertes cries, "Have at you now," and before Hamlet realizes that he is reattacked, the poisoned tip has torn into his arm or body. In the flurry of performing this despicable act, Laertes drops his weapon in his haste to get away and Hamlet drops his at the unexpected shock of steel ripping his flesh. In the mad scramble that follows, Laertes in panic and Hamlet in a rage, each retrieves the other's foil." That this explanation will satisfy anyone but the author of it may well be doubted. That Mr. Craig's notions about the scenes are somewhat muddled may be inferred from his remark (p. 21) that "there has been no satisfactory explanation of why Laertes should attempt to exchange swords [!] with Hamlet."

2 HENRY IV

With the financial assistance of the Carnegie Corporation and the American Philosophical Society, and under the sponsorship of the Modern Language Association of America, the J. B. Lippincott Company of Philadelphia has recently published Dr. Matthias A. Shaaber's edition of the second part of Shakspere's *Henry IV,* the twenty-third volume in the Furness Variorum. Even after only a casual examination of the book we are prepared to say that this is one of the best, fattest, and most serviceable volumes in the series. Dr. Shaaber has devoted years to the careful study of the play and the meticulous preparation of the book along the lines marked out by the famous and incomparable Horace Howard Furness.

Accordingly, we find here not only

the text of the play (the quarto text collated with the Folio), the textual varia (including emendations) directly beneath the text, and interpretative comments on single words and passages below these. In the course of years this arrangement has proved to be not only the most logical but the most practical. The editor claims to have made frequent use of the Oxford *Dictionary* in finding the exact meaning of obscure locutions which had not previously been explained to his satisfaction.

Following the text of the play is a long and minute discussion of the two primary texts and their relationship to each other. Dr. Shaaber argues for the theory that the quarto was printed from Shakspere's own manuscript of the play and that the Folio text was printed from a transcript "made by [Ralph] Crane or by some other professional scribe of similar working habits"—a conclusion which is sufficiently cautious to be generally acceptable. In the appendix dealing with the "sources" of the play, there are adequate extracts from *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth* (with comments on them by reputed critics), from Holinshed's *Chronicles* (again with comments), from Hall, from Stow, from Elyot, and from Samuel Daniel. Then follow some eighty-six pages of selections from the commentators. The Dering manuscript, now in the Folger Shakespeare Library, receives careful consideration in six pages. A short section (five pages) is devoted to "acting versions" and another (four pages) to a record of performances. Twenty-one pages of closely printed matter are required to list the books the editor has consulted in the preparation of this valuable contribution to Shaksperian scholarship. An unusually good index (thirty-three pages) winds up the book.

That the book is perfect we will not say. Undoubtedly it would be fairly easy to look for fly-speck imperfections and to find them. Thus, for example, we object to listing names in the index—*e.g.*, "Bensley (actor)," "Berry (actor)"—without giving their easily-ascertainable initials. And why is there nowhere a note on the proper pronunciation of the name "Bolingbroke," considering how uniformly this name is mispronounced? And why has nothing been said about the metrical evidence for the date of composition? And, finally, why does Professor Adams, the general editor, permit the depiction of a coat-of-arms on the covers which is not Shakspere's? Would it be possible to secure somewhere a grant of $1.50 for a new cut which would show the arms correctly?

SIR JOHN DAVIES

The Columbia University Press has just published a volume of facsimiles of the rare first editions of Sir John Davies's *Poems,* including his *Epigrammes and Elegies,* his *Orchestra, or, A Poem of Dauncing,* his famous *Nosce Teipsum,* his *Hymns of Astraea,* and his *Gulling Sonnets.* The book (consisting of 260 pages and priced at $3.) is ushered in with an easily readable though scholarly introduction by Dr. Clare Howard, Assistant Professor of English at Columbia University, and is rounded out with twenty pages of notes. The editor expresses the hope that the volume will be useful to the "learned" and pleasing to the "lewed," but we have our doubts as to this. The facsimile of the first 108 pages is so small (though undoubtedly the size of the original) and the letters are so broken and imperfect that we doubt that any would-be reader will take the trouble to decipher the text. Scholars, on the other hand, will be seriously disappointed

in a "bibliography" consisting of eighteen items.

A UNIQUE *KING LEAR*

Recently we had the privilege to witness a performance of *King Lear* which in many ways proved to be a source of unusual pleasure and satisfaction, though we went to the theatre expecting to be terribly disappointed if not disgusted. We came away thrilled and with a new sense of what wonders Shakspere can contribute to the modern theatre if intelligence and artistry are brought into play in producing and interpreting his works. In this case the producer was Mr. Erwin Piscator and the interpreters were a group of some well-known and some less well-known actors constituting the Dramatic Workshop of the New School and functioning in the Studio Theatre on West 12th Street. The cast, an excellent one of fine-looking persons, included Mr. Sam Jaffe as King Lear, Miss Rachel Adams as Generil, Miss Margaret Curtis as Regan (and what a malevolent Regan she was!), Mr. Enford Gage as Edgar (another magnificent portrayal), Mr. Roger de Koven as Edmund (fine and convincing toward the end of the play), Mr. Herbert Ranson as Kent (somewhat weak and too often inaudible, but picturesque), Mr. Ross Matthew as Gloster (he seemed to be the man himself), Miss Lysbeth Lynn as Cordelia (unconvincing, lacking in pathetic appeal), and Mr. Herbert Berghof as the Fool. The last was badly handicapped by his foreign accent but, notwithstanding this, he gave a most satisfying and pity-provoking performance; the ventriloquist's puppet which he employed as the medium through which to shoot his critical shafts at Lear was novel, perhaps startlingly so, but quite effective. New York critics objected to this innovation but it was really not so novel as they thought it to be: a steel engraving in the first volume of Sir Walter Scott's 1810-edition of the *Ancient British Drama* shows a court-fool with such a puppet. Mr. Berghof scored heavily with his pathetic death from exposure at the end of the scene on the heath (during which he never ceased to cling affectionately to his manikin.)

The text was, as usual and necessarily, greatly abridged, but this was done so judiciously that only the Shakspere specialist would have been conscious of a want of continuity. To this auditor the only objectionable features in the text were the introduction into it—because of Mr. Piscator's desire to give the play a modern meaning—of a symbolic prologue (consisting of the Cain-Abel story in pantomime) and of part of Ulysses' speech (*Troilus & Cressida,* I, iii, 119-24) as the closing lines of the play (spoken by Edgar).

Certain features of this production provoked considerable debate. First, there was the revolving stage which consisted of six or seven (we did not count them) oval platforms one above the other, each one smaller (in length and breadth) than the one below; this, looked at from the front, gave the impression of a flight of steps leading up into the sky. The steps were (or seemed) somewhat too high for comfortable ascent or descent and looked as though they might prove dangerous for the actors who had to go up and down and across them. The revolving feature was not only wholly unexceptionable but materially aided the movement of the drama.

Another novel feature of this production was the introduction of sound effects calculated to heighten the

sonority of Lear's outbursts in the storm, etc. To some in the audience this seemed very objectionable; to us it seemed, both theoretically and practically, a perfectly legitimate resort to any modern technical device calculated to heighten the artistry of the poet's grand conception.

The third most striking feature was the introduction of a ballet (at the opening of scene 3), which was considerably overdone, for the purpose of seemingly justifying Goneril's indignation and resentment at the riotous behavior of Lear and his hundred knights.

Of Mr. Jaffe's Lear we can say only that in his outbursts of rage and in his mad scenes he was every inch a king and that he often moved his audience to great pity for the sufferings of the outraged father and the impotent "fond, old man." The scene of Lear's death would have been much more effective had Lear died in an ecstasy of belief that his Cordelia was alive, instead of dying in despair as he tries to listen to her breathing.

COMMUNICATION

WHICH DANIEL?

Editor of the *Bulletin:*

Respectfully, may I comment on "A Daniel Come to Judgment" in the October issue of our *Bulletin?* That the Daniel of *The Merchant of Venice* is not the Daniel of the Jewish Book of Daniel, but is the Daniel of whom the Jews knew nothing, the Daniel of the Play being the Daniel of the Greek apocrypha, Susanna's Daniel, is the theme and the judgment of that article. Admiring the scholarship, may I presume to dissent from the judgment? The Daniel of the play was introduced by Shylock, a supposedly orthodox Jew, well-schooled in the canon. I cite Shylock himself as the main authority against the article.

The speech and behavior of Daniel of the Jewish and Aramaic *Book of Daniel* are dramatically analogous to those of Portia. The high-bred Jewish captive was the reviver and interpreter of the King's forgotten dream; Portia is the high-bred reviver and interpreter of Venice's forgotten enactment. Daniel was the interpreter and clarifier of a cryptic inscription; Portia the interpreter and clarifier of an ambiguous legal complex made up of a narrow racial (and old) ordinance which conflicted with the universal Law Merchant of Venice, an international port, perplexing to an ordinary judge. Daniel and Portia were called into their respective rôles unexpectedly. No one else was available or competent; both were welcomed at first by their respective prospective victims. "Then the King Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face and worshipped "Daniel," (*The Book of Daniel,* I, i.) "A Daniel come to judgment! Yea, a Daniel! O wise young judge, how do I honor thee!" exclaims Shylock (IV, 1), echoing the other Jewish captive and prophet, Ezekiel. Portia's first pronouncement was favorable to Shylock; after her final judgment, Shylock, appalled, gasps, "Is that the law?" (*Ibid.*) Gratiano screams: "A second Daniel! A Daniel, Jew! Now infidel I have *thee on the hip.*" . . . "A Daniel, still say I, a second Daniel! I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word." (IV, 2.) "Give me my money and let me go," says humbled Shy-

lock. O no, says Portia, the law has another hold on you; you're an alien who has attempted to murder a citizen, and your life is the forfeit. "In that night Belshazzar the Chaldean King was slain." (V. 30.)

The parallelism, I think, between Portia and the orthodox Daniel is greater than that between Portia and the so-called other Daniel. It was close enough to make clear the significance of both Shylock's and Gratiano's exclamations. Indeed, I find nothing at all in common between Portia's part in the play and Daniel's vindication of the virtuous Susanna. Shylock was making no false accusations against Antonio, as were the two perjurers against the hapless Susanna. Susanna's case is relatively melodramatic and commonplace; Shylock held a forfeited bond, with a leading merchant's seal on it, pledging a pound of flesh.

The theme of the *Bulletin* article is that there were two Daniels, of disparate talents and personalities, and that Shakspere ineptly picked the wrong Daniel, presumably not knowing about the right one. Dr. Goodspeed,[1] however, says that the canonical and the apocryphal Daniels are the same man, and that the Bel and Dragon chapters are clearly suggested by narratives in Daniel itself. All the older non-Jewish Bibles identified them as one and in the *Book* or *Prophecy of Daniel* the Douai Version still does just that.

"It is known that the reference [in the play] is not to the canonical Book of Daniel but to the apocryphal History of Susanna," says the article. Known to whom, pray? Is the knowledge a secret, held by a select few? Where is the proof, on the proof record, that Shylock had ever heard of Susanna or her clever young detective cross-examiner Daniel? Did not Shylock, as a faithful Jewish scripture reader, know all that the canon reveals about the Chaldean King's wise and courageous young Jewish interpreter, Daniel of the canon?

"Shakspere was not well posed in Jewish life," says the article. If this is put forward as an established fact, it is news to some of us. Perhaps it is merely an opinion; if so it should be so stated. Of Shaksperian settled facts there are few. Of Shaksperian opinions the supply is inexhaustible, luxuriant and varied. The fact that William Shakspere had given the names Susanna and Judith to his daughters might well justify the opinion that he knew about Susanna and Judith from the *Bible;* it would scarcely sustain the belief that he had never heard of the great Daniel.

The name Daniel, to Jew and Christian alike meaning the judgment or the wisdom of God, suited the Globe Theatre Company's purpose. That name was common among Jews and Gentiles. *Vide* George Eliot's Daniel Deronda.

Respecting the Ugaritic forms, and speaking with no disrespect, (it seems far-fetched to suggest that Shakspere could have meant (or his audiences understood) the Daniel referred to by Shylock and Gratiano as the Ugarit hero, the remote, shadowy forerunner of Susanna's Daniel, discriminating between that obscure Daniel and the famous dream-reader, cryptic interpreter and lion-tamer.

JOHN E. HANNIGAN.

---

[1]How Came the Bible, 1940.